DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 654 CG 021 529

TITLE Reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act: Runaway and Homeless Youth. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, One Hundredth Congress, Second Session on H.R. 1801 (Akron, Ohio).

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.

PUB DATE 5 Mar 88

NOTE 91p.; Serial No. 100-93. For related hearings, see ED 297 236 and CG 021 528-530.

AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402.

PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; Children; Delinquency; *Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; Financial Support; Hearings; *Runaways

IDENTIFIERS Congress 100th; *Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act 1974; *Runaway and Homeless Youth Act 1974

ABSTRACT

Text of a Congressional hearing on the reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, held in Akron, Ohio, is presented in this document. The hearing opens with a statement by Representative Dale E. Kildee, who states this hearing will focus on Title III of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act which authorizes services for youth in the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. The goal of this pact is described not as family unification, but as preparation for independent living. Testimony is presented by these witnesses: (1) State Representative Jane L. Campbell, Cleveland, Ohio; (2) Rebecca Devenanzio, director, Safe Space Station; (3) Dave Fair, executive director, Shelter Care, Inc., Akron, Ohio; (4) William P. Kannel, judge, Summit County Juvenile Court, Akron, Ohio; (5) Ann Kleon, Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, accompanied by her son, Joseph; (6) John H. Lawson, administrator and staff attorney, Safe Space Station, Cleveland, Ohio; (7) Midge Marangi, New Horizons Shelter; (8) Sally Maxton, executive director, Ohio Youth Services Network, Columbus, Ohio; and (9) Jane Yackshaw, director, Safe Space Station, Cleveland, Ohio. Prepared statements and supplemental materials were submitted by some of the above witnesses and by Douglas W. McCoard, executive director, Huckleberry House Inc.; W. Don Reader, family court division, court of common pleas, Stark County, Ohio; and Representative Thomas C. Sawyer, Congressional Representative from the State of Ohio. (ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT

Runaway and Homeless Youth

ED304654

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H.R. 1801

HEARING HELD IN AKRON, OH, MARCH 5, 1988

Serial No. 100-93

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

CE 052529

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
88-684 WASHINGTON : 1988

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

88-684 0 - 88 - 1

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
ROBERT E. WISE, JR., West Virginia
TIMOTHY J. PENNY, Minnesota
BILL RICHARDSON, New Mexico
TOMMY F. ROBINSON, Arkansas
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
CHESTER G. ATKINS, Massachusetts
JAMES JONTZ, Indiana
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan, *Chairman*

THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
(Ex Officio)
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
(Ex Officio)

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Akron, OH, March 5, 1988	1
Statement of:	
Campbell, Hon. Jane L., State Representative, Cleveland, OH	36
Devenanzio, Rebecca, director, Safe Space Station	77
Fair, Dave, executive director, Shelter Care, Inc., Akron, OH	6
Kannel, Hon. William P., judge, Summit County Juvenile Court, Akron, OH	17
Kleon, Ann, Cuyahoga Falls, OH, accompanied by her son, Joseph	16
Lawson, John H., administrator and staff attorney, Safe Space Station, Cleveland, OH	69
Marangi, Midge, New Horizons Shelter	47
Maxton, Sally, executive director, Ohio Youth Services Network, Columbus, OH	50
Yackshaw, Jane, director, Safe Space Station, Cleveland, OH	38
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera:	
Fair, David E., executive director, Shelter Care, Inc., Akron, OH, prepared statement of	10
Kannel, William P., judge, Summit County Juvenile Court, Akron, OH, prepared statement of	21
Lawson, John H., attorney, Safe Space Station, prepared statement of	70
Maxton, Sally, executive director, Ohio Youth Services Network, prepared statement of	58
McCoard, W. Douglas, executive director, Huckleberry House Inc., prepared statement of	81
Reader, Hon. W. Don, family court division, court of common pleas, Stark County, OH, prepared statement of	83
Sawyer, Hon. Thomas C., a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio, prepared statement of	4
Yackshaw, Jane, director, Safe Space Station, prepared statement of	44

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH ACT

SATURDAY, MARCH 5, 1988

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Akron, OH.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9 a.m., auditorium, Ocasek State Office Building, Akron, OH, Hon. Dale Kildee presiding.

Members present: Representatives Kildee and Sawyer.

Mr. KILDEE. The Subcommittee on Human Resources is here this morning in Akron, OH, to continue hearings on H.R. 1801, to reauthorize the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, for an additional 4 years.

Testimony this morning will focus on title III of the JJDPA, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. Title III authorizes services for runaway and homeless youth and has been an integral part of the JJDPA since its original enactment in 1974.

In 1977, it was amended to include services for homeless youth. Over the years, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act has made possible the provision of services to countless youth and families in crisis. In fact, the emphasis on including the family in the treatment process is one of the secrets of its tremendous success.

Experience clearly demonstrates that we are most helpful to the runaway when we help the family as a unit, try to treat that family as a unit. Homeless youth, on the other hand, and that is an increasing number in our society, do not have a family to which to return.

So, the goal of family unification in that sense is inapplicable. Instead, the goal for older homeless youth is preparation to live independently.

The testimony presented at earlier hearings strongly emphasized the need for services for runaways and for homeless youth. It also strongly emphasized that existing funding levels are insufficient.

One of the difficult things is that very often, a new shelter, a new facility, applying for money, knows full well that if it gets the money, another shelter will get less money, and that is a very, very difficult choice. So, we as a Congress have to look at the insufficient funds that are being used to address a growing problem.

At the same time, we need to look closely at how we currently spend our money and how we order our priorities, and one of the reasons that we have come to Ohio is the strong commitment that

communities like Akron have made to helping troubled youth and their families.

You have a very sensitive program here, one that is known to us in Washington, and we would like to try to see programs, to see what is making them work. It is not always money, although without money, very often nothing can work. We want to see what we can learn from those programs so we can hopefully help replicate the better parts of them as we reauthorize these programs.

I look forward to hearing the comments and suggestions of all the witnesses this morning. I would like to mention how fortunate, you know this without me saying this, and I do not say it only as a pro forma thing, how fortunate you are in Akron to have someone like Tom Sawyer representing you.

He is just an outstanding member of the subcommittee. I was delighted when he chose to come on this subcommittee and was selected for service. His rich background helped in that selection.

I always say that I want people in Congress with two things. I do not want to embarrass you, Tom. A good head and a good heart. You have to have both. Really, you have to be bright and intelligent, but also have a good feeling toward people, and Tom has certainly brought that to this subcommittee, and we appreciate that.

Tom, do you have an opening statement?

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to welcome all of my constituents as well as Congressman Dale Kildee of Michigan and his staff to Akron today. As the chairman of the House Education and Labor Subcommittee on Human Resources, Dale Kildee epitomizes the qualities that he praises in others.

I would also like to welcome today's witnesses. I know that some folks have traveled a good distance to be here today, and I appreciate the valuable assistance that they will provide.

I would especially like to say thanks to Judge Bill Kannel and to Shelter Care Director Dave Fair for appearing with us today.

You know, at school and at home, many kids today face pressures and problems that are too large not only for them but for their families and sometimes the communities they live in to tackle alone.

Fortunately, because of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, many children who are in crisis, who once found only danger and violence on the streets, can now find safety and understanding and help and guidance at the shelters across the nation, where dedicated professionals and volunteers who staff them have helped many kids regain their self-esteem, take control of their lives, and either move on to adulthood or sometimes, even more importantly, find a way to return to their own childhood.

There is no question that runaway shelters help to rebuild family relationships and help kids in crisis to address their problems directly and to learn how to choose their own futures.

There are more than a million kids in this country who run away every year. I am not sure anybody really knows the number, and, yet, of those who get to shelters, we can demonstrate that over 80 percent of those are well-served and are either returned to their families or placed in foster homes or in independent living programs.

The truth of the matter is that only about one-fourth of those who are in need are able to be served by the current level of services provided by existing shelters, and while many shelters have been able to supplement their Federal funding with State and local money, others exist on shoestring budgets, an enormously difficult task given the problems of their clients.

Despite the success of the runaway shelter program, which Dale Kildee has worked with for a number of years, the President, for the seventh consecutive year, has recommended that the Juvenile Justice and Runaway Act be zeroed out in the fiscal 1989 budget request. And for the seventh consecutive year, I am confident that the Congress is going to retain full funding for those programs.

But in addition to restoring those funds, Congress also needs to focus on another dilemma facing runaway shelters. There is clearly a need for more shelters across the country, but the only way to establish them, as Congressman Kildee mentioned, is to drain funds from existing shelters whose budgets are already strained.

In fact, at a recent hearing before this subcommittee in Washington, HHS announced that 25 additional shelters would be funded under the Runaway Act in fiscal year 1988.

We must find ways to assure that those kids who are most in need find a way to receive shelter and assistance. My view is that one of the ways to accomplish that is to take the funds that are available and put those dollars into the place where they will do the most good, to increase to 90 percent the proportion of those existing funds that are available for direct grants to shelters.

But it is also clear that Congress has got to encourage further public and private support for these programs. Akron is a city that—like communities across the industrial Midwest, such as Congressman Kildee's home in Flint, MI—have recognized our share of economic turmoil. Yet many of us have had the foresight to recognize the impact of that kind of economic instability on families and on children.

Judge Kannel, Dave Fair, the people of Summit County have given their support to Safe Landing. It is an outstanding example of what government and communities can do when they work together.

So, in closing, let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the services provided in these kinds of shelters are extraordinarily important, have proven to be extremely successful and represent a sound place to invest this country's resources if we are going to provide the kind of safe and secure setting for families to grow in the future.

I thank you very much for being here.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Thomas C. Sawyer follows:]

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC

THOMAS C. SAWYER
14th DISTRICT, OHIO

EDUCATION AND LABOR
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN TOM SAWYER
AT THE HUMAN RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING ON
THE RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH ACT

March 5, 1988
Akron, Ohio

As an educator and as a former administrator at a school for delinquent boys, I know firsthand the multiple problems of troubled youth. At school and at home, many children are facing pressure and problems too large for them, and their families, to tackle alone.

Fortunately, because of the federal Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (RHYA), many children in crisis who once found danger and violence on the streets can now find safety, understanding, and guidance at shelters across the nation. The dedicated professionals who staff these shelters have helped many children regain their self-esteem and take control of their lives.

There is no question that runaway shelters help to rebuild family relationships and help kids in crisis to address their problems directly and to learn how to choose their own futures. Over one million children run away each year, yet almost 80% of those served by shelters return to their families, are placed in foster homes, or are placed in independent living programs.

Today's troubled youth have multiple needs, and existing runaway shelters are being asked to provide diverse services with limited budgets. Shelters across the country report:

* increased numbers of youth who have been physically or sexually abused;
* more youth with serious mental health problems;
* a growing number of chronically dysfunctional families;
* more substance abuse by youths and families; and
* more youth at higher risk for suicide.

Before the needs of these youth can be adequately addressed, further investment is needed for basic shelter services. According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the RHYA serves only about one-fourth of those children in need of shelter and other services. While many shelters have been able to acquire supplemental state and local funding, others exist on shoestring budgets, a difficult task given the changing needs of their clients.

Despite the obvious success of these programs and the need for more shelters, President Reagan for the seventh consecutive year has recommended that the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act and the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act be zeroed

1338 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-3518
Telephone (202) 225-3231

Federal Building
2 South Main St., Suite 405
Akron, OH 44308-1810
Telephone (216) 375-5710

THIS STATIONERY PRINTED ON PAPER MADE WITH RECYCLED FIBERS

out in his fiscal 1989 budget request. And for the seventh year in a row, Congress will restore full funding for these programs.

In addition to restoring these funds, Congress will also focus on another serious problem facing runaway shelters. There is clearly a need for more shelters across the country, but under current law new facilities would be funded at the expense of existing shelters' already strained budgets. At a recent hearing before the Subcommittee, HHS announced that 25 additional shelters will be funded under the RHYA in fiscal 1988.

Congress and President Reagan must find ways to ensure that children in need receive shelter and assistance. Given the limited funds available, this can best be accomplished by targeting at least 90% of the RHYA's funds for basic shelter grants. Remaining funds would continue to be used for the important research and demonstration projects that are needed to help service providers respond to the changing needs of their clients.

In addition to shelters and crisis counseling, other needed services which must be adequately funded include:

* coordinated health services, including mental health;
* alternative education programs, including remedial education and tutoring, and dropout prevention;
* outreach and prevention; and
* emerging service needs, particularly long-term care.

Congress must also encourage further public and private support for runaway and homeless youth programs. Akron is a city in transition, and has seen its share of economic turmoil. However, our community had the foresight to recognize the impact such economic instability has on families and children. Under the guidance of Judge Kannel, the Akron Junior League, Dave Fair, and others, the people of Summit County gave their support for the establishment of the Safe Landing Shelter. Recently, the community donated land, building materials, workers, and so on to establish the second Safe Landing Shelter in Akron. Safe Landing is an outstanding example of what government and communities can do when they work together.

In closing, let me reiterate that the services provided at runaway shelters have proven to be extremely successful, not only in providing shelter for children, but in reuniting families and helping children get their lives back on track. With a stronger commitment from federal, state, and local government, and greater community awareness, we can all ensure that no child is left alone in the dark.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much, Tom.

Our first panel this morning will consist of Judge William P. Kannel, Summit County Juvenile Court, Akron, OH.

Dave Fair, Executive Director of Shelter Care, Akron, OH.

And Ms. Ann Kleon and her son, Joseph, Cuyahoga Falls, OH.

If they would come forward to the witness table here. Your prepared statements will be included in their entirety in the record, and you may summarize in any fashion you wish.

[Pause.]

Mr. KILDEE. Before we start, I had the pleasure of chatting with former Senator—I will call him Senator. Once you are a Senator, you are always a Senator, just like a judge, right? Senator Ocasek for whom this building is named and whose name is known outside the state of Ohio. I am glad to have you here today, Senator.

OK. Judge Kannel.

Mr. SAWYER. I think Dave Fair is going to start off.

Mr. KILDEE. All right. Fine. Very good.

STATEMENT OF DAVID E. FAIR, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SHELTER CARE, INC., AKRON, OH

Mr. FAIR. I get to go first. I am the leadoff man.

Mr. Chairman, I am reminded this morning of the two little cats that were locked in the racquetball match. One said to the other, "It takes a lot of guts to play that game." And the other one said, "I know. My father is in that racquet."

Mr. KILDEE. I told jokes worse than that when I taught school.

Mr. FAIR. I have mixed emotions about being here this morning because I usually play racquetball about this time over at the Y, but it is a sacrifice that I am glad to make and I would like to welcome you to Akron.

My name is David Fair, and I am the executive director of Shelter Care, which is the parent organization of the Safe Landing Youth Shelter.

I have served in this capacity for the past sixteen years and have been a part of the opening, the planning and the operating of Safe Landing.

The purpose of this testimony is to give you as committee members a first-hand awareness—can you hear me all right? A first-hand awareness of how essential the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act is to the young people of Akron.

We are part of a network of excellent programs throughout the state of Ohio, and it is my hope that your deliberations over the reauthorization of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, that this on-site hearing and your visit to Safe Landing, will serve as a meaningful point of reference.

In light of this, I would like to share with you some of the history of the Akron runaway shelter. The need for a runaway facility in Akron was first recognized by the Junior League in 1976, when the public affairs committee met with the director of the Summit County Juvenile Court.

A juvenile court levy issue endorsed by the League had failed the previous fall and the committee asked if there were projects that

they could help with. The director's response was to describe the situation in the detention center that morning.

A 15-year old girl had been kicked out of her home by her stepfather for smoking. The police found her and took her to the detention center. Meanwhile, a 16-year old had just returned from New York for prostitution and was also now at the detention center.

In the director's words, here is a young girl who has been told by her family that she is out on her own, and we have introduced her to someone who can teach her how to support herself.

Committee members became excited about the concept of the League's establishing a residential center for youth in crisis, whether they were runaways, throwaways or status offenders.

The following year, the community research committee met with the directors of the children-serving agencies in the county to discuss the needs for runaway facilities. At this time, the Birch Bayh law was just coming into effect. The status offenders could no longer be housed with delinquent children as an alternative to the detention center. This was now a necessity.

At that time, Akron was the only metropolitan area in the State that did not have a runaway shelter. In the spring of 1977, after months of study, the Junior League voted to undertake this project. A $30,000 grant was awarded to the Office of Juvenile Justice for the purpose of planning a runaway shelter for youth.

Finding the facility, renovating it, furnishing it, getting it funded on its own were all major concerns. The Junior League pulled together many resources within the community to accomplish this. Concurrently, they were applying for operational funding through the Department of Health and Human Services for money made available through the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.

These funds, along with the start-up grant, provided through the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, and cash matched by the Junior League served as the funding base for this project.

On October 1, 1978, Safe Landing officially opened its doors and kids knocked on it. On September 1, 1979, Safe Landing was officially turned over to Shelter Care by the Junior League. The League has continued its involvement in the program through special project-type funding and through present and past members serving the leadership roles on the advisory committee.

The initial program was designed to provide for a capacity of eight young people. By necessity, this was expanded within the first 6 months of operation to 10. Within the second year, it was 12, and the third year, to 14.

In 1985, a needs assessment by the advisory committee recommended that Safe Landing be expanded by adding a second facility. This would provide for a resident capacity of 24 young people.

Shortly after this recommendation was made, the Home Builders Association of Akron constructed a model home in Chapel Hill Mall for the Annual Home and Garden Show. Without solicitation, the Home Builders Association donated this house to be used as the new girls' Safe Landing Youth Shelter. Not only did they donate the house, but they redesigned it to meet all of the local building codes and we constructed it on the permanent site.

The property where the shelter is located is at 585 Seiberling Street in Akron, and this property was donated by the Rice Oil Co.

On August 1, 1987, the Safe Landing Youth Shelter for Girls was opened, and the original facility, located at 39 West Cuyahoga Falls Avenue, became the Safe Landing Youth Shelter for Boys.

The growth of Safe Landing, which was motivated by an increased need for services, was made possible by expanded local support from service groups, churches, businesses, individuals and funding agencies. Today, Safe Landing has an average daily population of sixteen young people, with an average length of stay of 9 days.

This is in addition to the young people and families who are served by the 24-hour crisis phone line or who are provided drop-in counselling services.

With the increase in services, there has also been an increase in the budget. The current annual budget is $480,000 with approximately fifteen percent or $64,000 coming from the Department of Health and Human Services through the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.

I give these figures to indicate how the local community has given support to this program and how, at the same time, the federal dollars have decreased slightly as a result of the need to develop new programs.

Programmatically, Safe Landing is connected with a network of youth-serving agencies in our own community as well as a network of similar programs throughout the state of Ohio. Within Summit County, the Juvenile Court has served as a leader in coordinating services for children. Their efforts have been enhanced by the Summit Group and the local cluster. These groups, comprised of agency directors, meet regularly to plan and implement strategies that will provide for the needs of troubled children, including runaways.

This year, it is projected that Safe Landing will provide help for approximately 750 young people. Many of these are runaways, some are throwaways or young people who have been forced out of their homes. All are experiencing some type of crisis.

Approximately 25 percent of the young people coming to Safe Landing are alleging abuse, dependency or neglect, and many of these will be placed in the Summit County Children's Services Ward rather than returning home.

Safe Landing provides a healthy environment, free from exploitation, where a young person can, with the help of a caring staff, sort through their problems and make responsible choices. Perhaps the most meaningful statistic in the materials you have been given today is that each year, since the beginning of Safe Landing, less than 10 percent of the young people in residence have left in an unplanned way.

Each young person is there because of his or her own choice, and the program is structured to give individualized attention.

My purpose here is not to give an in-depth description of the program and services of Safe Landing, but, rather, to emphasize that Safe Landing as well as the other runaway shelters in the state of Ohio are more than just flop houses for kids.

We are prepared to deal with the troubled young person alleging abuse, dependency or neglect. The young person who is drug or alcohol dependent. The young person who is threatening suicide as well as the young person who has just runaway as a result of a situation of disturbance in the home.

As director of Safe Landing, I would like to make several recommendations to you as a committee, as you consider reauthorization of this important act.

First, I recommend that you support an increase in the amount of money allocated for runaway shelters. This increase should be commensurate with the inflationary costs that programs have incurred over the past years. Most of the runaway shelters in this state have not received any increase since the original funding and most have received a decrease in funding.

The second recommendation is that runaway and homeless youth, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act be amended to ensure that not less than ninety percent of the funding go to already-existing programs for operational costs.

This would leave some monies for the start-up of new programs as well as for discretionary grants.

The third recommendation is that a concerted effort be made to inform Congress of the programmatic and cost-effectiveness of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. Programmatically, it is effective because the runaway shelter is often the entry point in the system for troubled young people.

Many more serious problems can be avoided when help is administered at this point.

From a cost perspective, it is effective because most runaway shelters have secured local funding and do not depend entirely on federal monies.

In addition, the per diem rate in our runaway shelter continues to be well below that of hospitals and residential treatment programs.

Mr. Chairman and Congressman Sawyer, I would like to thank you for the opportunity of sharing our program as well as our concerns with you.

In closing, I would like to invite you both personally to visit both of our Safe Landing shelters following today's program as well as the others here.

[The prepared statement of David E. Fair follows:]

Prepared Statement of

David E. Fair, Executive Director
Safe Landing Youth Shelter
Akron, Ohio

HEARING ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF
THE RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH ACT

HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

March 5, 1988

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, my name is David Fair, and I am the Executive Director of Shelter Care which is the parent organization for the Safe Landing Youth Shelter. I have served in this capacity for the past 16 years and have been a part of the planning, opening and operating of the Safe Landing Program. The purpose of this testimony is to give you, as Committee members, a firsthand awareness of how essential the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act is to the young people of Akron, Ohio. We are a part of a network of the excellent programs throughout the state of Ohio, and it is my hope that in your deliberations over the Reauthorization of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, that this oversight hearing and your visit to Safe Landing will serve as a meaningful point of reference. In light of this, I would like to share with you some of the history of Akron's runaway shelter.

The need for a runaway facility in Akron was first recognized by the Junior League in 1976 when the Public Affairs Committee met with the Director of the Summit County Juvenile Court. A Juvenile Court levy issue endorsed by the league had failed the previous fall, and the Committee asked if there were projects the court, therefore, would not be able to do. The Director's response was to describe the situation in the detention center that morning. A 15-year old girl had been kicked out of her home by her stepfather for smoking; the police found her and took her to the detention center. Meanwhile, a 16-year old had just returned from New York for prostitution and was also now at the detention center. In the Director's words, "Here's a young girl who's been told by her family that she's on her own, and we've introduced her to someone who can teach her how to support herself."

Committee members became excited about the concept of the League establishing a residential center for youth in crisis, be they runaways, throwaways or status offenders.

The following year the community research committee met with the directors of the children serving agencies in the county to discuss the need for a runaway facility. At this time the Birch Bayh law was just coming into effect. Status offenders could no longer be housed with delinquent children and an alternative to the detention center was now a necessity. At that time Akron was the only metropolitan area in the state that did not have a runaway shelter.

In the spring of 1977, after months of study, the Junior League voted to undertake this project. A $30,000 grant was awarded through the Office of Juvenile Justice for the purpose of planning a runaway shelter for youth.

Finding a facility, renovating it, furnishing it, getting it funded and zoned were all major concerns. The Junior League pulled together many resources within the community to accomplish this. Concurrently they were applying for operational funding through the Department of Health and Human Services for monies made available through the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. These funds, along with a start-up grant provided through the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, and the cash match by the Junior League, served as the funding base for this project.

On October 1, 1978, Safe Landing officially opened its' doors. And kids knocked on them. On September 1, 1979, Safe Landing was officially turned over to Shelter Care by the Junior League.

The League has continued its' involvement in the program through special project type funding and through present and past members serving in leadership roles on the Advisory Committee.

The initial program was designed to provide for a capacity of eight young people. By necessity this was expanded within the first six months of operation to ten, within the second year to 12 and the third year to 14. In 1985, a needs assessment conducted

by the Advisory Committee recommended that Safe Landing be expanded by adding a second facility. This would provide for a resident capacity of 24 young people. Shortly after this recommendation was made, the Home Builders Association of Akron constructed a model home in the Chapel Hill Mall for the Annual Home and Garden Show. Without solicitation the Home Builders Association donated this house to be used as the new girls' Safe Landing Youth Shelter; not only did they donate the house, but they redesigned it to meet all of the local building codes and reconstructed it on the permanent site. The property where the shelter is located at 587 Seiberling Street in Akron was donated by the Rice Oil Company.

On August 1, 1987, the Safe Landing Youth Shelter for Girls was open, and the original facility located at 39 W. Cuyahoga Falls Avenue became the Safe Landing Youth Shelter for Boys.

The growth of Safe Landing which was motivated by an increased need for services was made possible by expanded local support from service groups, churches, businesses, individuals and funding agencies.

Today Safe Landing has an average daily population of 16 young people, with an average length of stay of nine days. This is in addition to the young people and families who are served by the 24-hour crisis phone line, or who are provided drop-in counseling services.

With the increase in services there has also been an increase in the budget. The current annual budget is $480,000 with 15% or $64,000 coming from the Department of Health and Human Services through the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. I give these figures to indicate how the local community has given support to this program and how, at the same time, the federal dollars have decreased slightly as result of the development of new programs.

Programmatically, Safe Landing is connected with a network of youth serving agencies in our own community, as well as a network

of similar programs throughout the state of Ohio. Within Summit County the Juvenile court has served as a leader in coordinating services to children; their efforts have been enhanced by the Summit Group and the local cluster. These groups comprised of agency directors meet regularly to plan and implement strategies that will provide for the needs of troubled children, including runaways.

This year it is projected that Safe Landing will provide help for approximately 1750 young people. Many of these are runaways some are throwaways or young people who have been forced out of their home; all are experiencing some type of crisis. Approximately 25% of the young people coming to Safe Landing are alleging abuse, dependency, or neglect, and many of these will be placed with the Summit County Children Services Board rather than returning home.

Safe Landing provides a healthy environment free from exploitation where a young person can, with the help of caring staff, sort through their problems and make responsible choices. Perhaps the most meaningful statistic in the materials you have been given today is that each year since the beginning of Safe Landing less than 10% of the young people in residence have left in an unplanned way. Each young person is there because of his or her own choice, and the program is structured to give individualized attention.

My purpose here is not to give you an indepth description of the program and services of Safe Landing, but rather to emphasize that Safe Landing, as well as the other runaway shelters in the state of Ohio are more than just flop houses for kids. We are prepared to deal with the troubled young person alleging abuse, dependency or neglect, the young person who is drug or alcohol dependent, the young person who is threatening suicide, as well as the young person who has just run away as a result of a situational distrubance in the home.

As Director of Safe Landing, I would like to make several recommendations to you as committee members as you consider the

reauthorization of this important act:

First, I recommend that you support an increase in the amount of monies allocated for runaway shelters. This increase should be commensurate with the inflationary costs that programs have incurred over the past years. Most of the runaway shelters in this state have not received any increase since the initial funding and most have received a decrease in funding.

The second recommendation is that the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act be ammended to insure that not less than 90% of the funding go to already existing programs for operational costs. This would leave some monies for the start-up of new programs, as well as for discretionary grants.

The third recommendation is that a concerted effort be made to inform congress of the programmatic and cost effectiveness of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. Programmatically, it is effective because the runaway shelter is often the entry point in the system for troubled young people. Many more serious problems can be avoided when help is administered at this point. From a cost perspective, it is effective because most runaway shelters have secured local funding and do not depend entirely on these federal monies. In addition, the per diem rate in a runaway shelter continues to be well below that of hospitals or residential treatment programs.

Mr. Chairman, and Congressman Sawyer, I would like to thank you for the opportunity of sharing our program, as well as our concerns with you, and in closing I would like to personally invite you to visit both of our Safe Landing Shelters following today's program. Thank you.

David E. Fair, Executive Director
Safe Landing Youth Shelter

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much, Mr. Fair.

We have with us today Ms. Ann Kleon and her son, Joseph, who would like to talk to you about an experience in their lives.

Ms. Kleon.

STATEMENT OF ANN KLEON, CUYAHOGA FALLS, OH, ACCOMPANIED BY HER SON, JOSEPH

Ms. KLEON. In 1984, we had a dramatic change in our family. The death of my husband. I had to take a job. So, for 1 year, Joe and I had turmoil in our lives, and, so, in 1985, he decided he could not live at the house anymore and, so, he ran away.

So, not knowing what to do, the police picked him up and took him to Juvenile Court, but they do not hold them there. They only put them in a holding cell and within two hours, the child is back in the home again.

So, when I would not go down and pick him up, they took him to Safe Landing. I had heard about Safe Landing, but never thought I would ever have any experience with it.

It was a wonderful place. He went to school. He had chores to do. We received counselling, and because of the counselling that we received there, we went on to counselling on our own afterwards, and we are here today, we live together, we get along, we have a healthy, happy home now, and I feel that because of what happened and with Safe Landing's help, we were able to establish that relationship between us.

He is in school now. He is in college. And Safe Landing could not have done more for us, and it cost us nothing. They were just—they just had so many things that they had to do there that he was not—could not—did not do at home, like chores and I just could go on and on. It is a great place. I would recommend it highly, and I am glad that kids that do have the need have a place to go.

Mr. KILDEE. Joseph.

Mr. KLEON. Hello. My name is Joe Kleon, and I am here to talk about my experience with Safe Landing.

Back when I was 16 years old, I was the typical radical street kid that would not listen to anybody and knew all the answers and I had just my father about a year ago, and just decided that home was not the place I wanted to be. So, I took to the streets and was staying with some friends and doing this and that.

It was not long before I was picked up by the police and taken to the Detention Center and I had a choice of either staying there or going to Safe Landing, and I did not want to stay there in a cell, so I had them take me to Safe Landing.

I remember walking through the door one night about 2:30 in the morning, you know, with this attitude that I was going to stay there for the night and then, you know, end up leaving in the morning, and talking to the person that was there at night really changed my attitude.

They were not there to give you the typical lectures that us young people are so used to hearing. We spent a lot of time listening to us, which I thought was really important, and letting us bring our feelings out, and help us to deal with them, and they also

stressed the positive qualities of each individual there, instead of focusing on the negative aspects of our life.

They tried to bring out the positive parts of everyone, and I am a guitar player and as soon as they found that out, somebody brought a guitar in and encouraged me to play and to work on things and they spent a lot of time in individual as well as group discussion, helping us to deal with our feelings and just to try and get our lives together, and it really did make a difference.

I can say now that I am part of a happy family, and I hope that Safe Landing receives the support of everybody in this room because they are really doing a good job for the community.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much.

Judge KANNEL. I think that this is a good time to close these hearings.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM P. KANNEL, JUDGE, SUMMIT COUNTY JUVENILE COURT, AKRON, OH

Judge KANNEL. What can I add to that testimony, and I think those are the kinds of things that the Congress need to hear from the people who have experienced the service and you can see that the money that you are appropriating in Washington is really going to such services.

Chairman Kildee and Congressman Sawyer, I certainly wish to be a part of welcoming you here to Akron and appreciate this opportunity to appear before you in support of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.

I certainly would urge passage of H.R. 1801, which is the reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Act.

I am Bill Kannel, juvenile court judge in Summit County, and I have been with this court for over 40 years and have been the judge since 1971.

So, I, as the judge, can certainly assure you that we are very happy to tell you about our experiences with funds from this bill and would urge local communities, such as ours, to be given more support to maintain these programs for our troubled runaway families, really.

By the way, I have reviewed Judge Radcliffe's testimony and personally talked with him. He sends his regards to both of you, and I would, as far as the National Juvenile Family Judge's position on reauthorization with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, I would support that.

Having been a part of the justice system, juvenile justice system, for so many years, and associated with the National Association, I feel very strongly that they have done a tremendous job in training of judges and referees. I think that through their national college, they are reaching juvenile judges throughout the country and, so often, lawyers come on to this bench with absolutely no background whatsoever and usually one of the first experiences, if they go to the National College of Juvenile Judges, and as a result of that get a real background to help them do this very difficult job which is really a little different from the legal and the judicial experiences they might have had.

By the way, I would like to say that Judge Don Reader from the Starke County Juvenile Judge, Juvenile Court, is here with us today and he is vice president of the National Association, soon to be president, in a couple of years.

Don. Here he is. Happy to have Don with us.

I think probably that I can best serve my purpose here today by talking a little bit about the Juvenile Court's philosophy and telling you about what I feel is a very strong community who are involved in the juvenile justice system and how we handle the runaway youth in some counties.

I have always had the philosophy of developing diversion programs for youth and diverting them from the juvenile justice system and urging the community to provide services to help these young people and these troubled families.

As a juvenile court referee for many years, I heard all of the children that were brought in to the juvenile court for many years, and one of my greatest frustrations was to hear these status offenders, these runaways, come before me, locked up in secured custody, and not having the resources to deal with them, and that is why I am so very pleased by these community projects, such as Safe Landing, that help us divert these children from the juvenile justice system and return them to their families, as you heard here, with strong help and counselling.

It was—I can remember back in the late sixties and the early seventies, when we were really having this tremendous problem with the runaway youth, and everybody was interested in forming runaway shelters, and I cringed at some of the people that were interested in establishing these because I felt very strongly that it was necessary that they come under the direction of credible people.

Thus, when Wilton Wortman, who is in our audience, from the Junior League and her committee came to us and we suggested they get into this business, I was very pleased to give my full support. I could go on and on and talk about the history of the Junior League in Akron and the many, many excellent programs that they have started.

Our Guardian Ad Litem Program was started by the Akron Junior League and run by that and still is supported by that.

But as an organization which motivates and starts projects, they soon looked for somebody to run it, and they came to Dave Fair and his Shelter Care agency to take over this operation around 1980. And here again, I assure you that it could not be in better hands.

Dick Wright, Oliver Ocasek and some of the advisory board of Dave's committee are here, and the community is organized. We laugh at our board meetings that the people—you heard about the Home Builders. You heard about the Rice Oil. You have heard about the—well, you did not hear about Paul Tell, but at practically every board meeting, somebody is coming to Dave and wanting to donate property or a house or a building and we laugh about it all the time.

But that is because of the credibility of Dave Fair and his organization and what he is doing for these troubled families, and that is the credibility that he holds within this community, and I am very

happy to be a part of that and be on his advisory board and keeping a close touch on the Shelter Care, which is so helpful to us.

It is a community project again. The Junior League is still very much involved as well as all these other organizations, and this is another—epitomizes another part of my philosophy of the juvenile court system, and that is utilization of community resources and people.

I have probably one of the only women's board to a juvenile court center in the country, and they are in our facility. They meet there. They conduct tours there. They provide resources for children that cannot be provided by public funds. We utilize volunteers on the one-on-one program and the guardian ad litem program is all volunteers, and I feel very strongly by the use of lay citizens and the community in any institution, is going to be a better institution and you are going to have this effective communication with the general community, and then, when you have problems and you have needs, you can go to this community, which is true in Summit County, and they will support you without any problem.

And I assure you that you have heard about Safe Landing and what a good organization it is. The Juvenile Court has a fine and strong working relationship with Safe Landing. I am on the advisory board. We have a contract with Dave. We give them operating funds from our Department of Youth Services, grant money, and the use of these services for runaway youth has been a big factor in our being able to be in compliance with the Juvenile Justice Act and diverting kids, keeping them out of secured custody and without these facilities, we could not.

I went back to 1974 and checked our runaway referrals, and found that in 1974, we had 794 referrals for runaways, which was approximately ten percent of our overall court referrals, and I have included in my statement a list of referrals through 1987, and you can see in 1987, we had 321 referrals or about six percent of the overall court referrals.

But in addition to that, there is an additional 22 percent that are handled nonlogged, nondocketed as far as court referrals, diverted into the community agencies for help and being not appropriate for court action, and the many, many referrals that we get now, as Ms. Kleon said here, we did not lock Joe up, we took him to the Shelter Care and he got the help that was needed there.

So, there is no question in my mind that this facility has been very, very helpful to us in doing a better job for the troubled families in our community.

We have a decline in the referrals. Last year, I checked and we detained seventeen runaways in secured custody in 1987. Six of these were out of county children which sometimes are difficult to—well, all we are doing is holding them till we get them back to their home community and let them deal with them.

But and even in checking with the seventeen individual children, we got a printout from the computer and most all of those cases that were detained in secured custody last year were—had delinquency referrals in addition to the runaway in about every case. So, that—what I am saying is that we are trying not to hold any status offenders, especially on first offense, in secured custody.

And here again, I can certainly vouch that this shelter is a valuable service to our children not only for the purpose of diverting them from the juvenile justice system, but also keeping runaway children from being placed in secured custody and as Joe has described here.

And, you know, this is really the only way that we can carry out this process is by having a Safe Landing and a place to do this.

And another thing, as I said before, is that certainly this is a dedicated staff as well as Dave attracting support from the community in this situation, many of his staff are here and if you could spend the time to meet them, you would see that they are dedicated people and just as Joe and Ms. Kleon described them here in working with these children and bringing out the positives.

In addition to the community support, I have seen my own intake staff, all the police units in Summit County, actually have developed the confidence in this facility where most all of the police departments in Summit County do not take the children, many of the children to the detention center anymore, they take them to Safe Landing, and if you know anything about developing police credibility, developing credibility with police, you know that you have got to prove yourself, and Dave had to prove that he was running a facility there, as he described there, that was not a flop house and that was handled in the right way and I think if you talk to the police units in Summit County, you would find that that is the kind of credibility and they are assured that this is a humane competent service for these families with a crisis.

And I say to you, and I know you go around the country and you appropriate all of this money and you wonder whether you are doing any good, and I think that probably this is one program, I think if you go across the country, everything that I am reading about runaway shelters is pretty positive, and I think that if you go across the country, I think this is one program where federal funds have been a proven success, especially in the Runaway and Youth Shelter Act, and many times as you get into training and research programs, it is almost impossible to measure what you are doing with your funds.

But I think these runaway programs, such as Safe Landing, are intervening in young peoples' lives at a very early and a crucial stage and they need the fiscal resources in order to do it, and if this testimony does not move you, why, all of my words are not going to mean anything.

So, I just want to assure you that there is tremendous community support in Summit County and the services connected to best help young people is in a very positive and humane way should offer you that assurance that you are—you people are certainly a large part of a solution to a very crucial problem, and I again thank you for coming to Akron and we would be very happy to show you any resources that we have here and answer any questions that you might have.

[The prepared statement of Judge William P. Kannel follows:]

The County of Summit Juvenile Court
Division of Court of Common Pleas
650 Dan Street, Akron, Ohio 44310-2085

CHARLES T. SIMONSON
Director of Juvenile Court Center
JAMES R. CANNATA
Assistant Director of Juvenile Court Center
DAVID S. ALEXANDER
Director of Assessment and Evaluation Services

WILLIAM P. KANNEL
Judge
NEAL D. VERITY
Chief Referee
BERNARD M. SCHWARTZ
Referee
JOHN E. VUILLEMIN
Referee

Prepared Statement of

William P. Kannel, Judge

Summit County Juvenile Court

Akron, Ohio

Hearing on the Reauthorization of

the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act

House Subcommittee on Human Resourses

U.S. House of Representatives

March 5, 1988

Chairman Kildee, Representative Sawyer, members of the subcommittee. I welcome you here in Akron and appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today in support of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. I would urge that H.R. 1801, the bill to reauthorize the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Act, be passed.

I am William P. Kannel, Juvenile Court Judge from Summit County, Ohio. I have been with this Court for over 40 years, and judge since 1971. I can certainly assure you that we here in Summit County are very happy to tell you about our experience with funds from this bill and I would urge local communities such as ours be given even more support to maintain programs for troubled runaway youth.

I have reviewed Judge Gerald Radcliffe's testimony and personally talked with him -- he sends his regards to Chairman Kildee and Representative Sawyer -- and I would support the National Juvenile and Family Judges' position on re-authorization of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. Having been a part of juvenile justice for many years, I certainly feel the national association has done an excellent job of training juvenile judges and referees. Their National College and conferences have proven very valuable through the years.

I can best serve my purpose here today by talking about my Court's philosophy, telling you about strong community involvement and how we handle the runaway youth in Summit County.

I have always been a strong advocate of our Juvenile Court utilizing and promoting community resources to aid troubled young people and if possible divert them from the Juvenile Justice system, returning them to their families with strong help. In the late '60's and early '70's there was a real rush and interest in forming of runaway shelters. I felt strongly it was very important that they be organized under the direction of credible people. Thus, when the Junior League of Akron proposed starting such a shelter, I was very pleased to give my full support. My history with the Junior League has been excellent. They have motivated and helped start many, many programs. In fact, my Guardian ad Litem program was started by the Junior League. They did an excellent job in organizing this shelter and Safe Landing was started in 1972.

As an organization which only starts projects, they asked Dave Fair and his Shelter Care agency to take over its operation around 1980. Here again, I was very much involved and I assure you it couldn't be in better hands. This shelter is still a community project as the Junior League is still involved along with many other persons on its Advisory Board. Dave will tell you about the Home Builders and many, many other people and organizations which make this an excellent agency. My feeling is that the utilization and having the community involved always makes for stronger programs and better agencies. I can attest to that by saying that the Summit County Juvenile Court has a Women's Board, utilizes volunteers in our delinquency programs as well as our Guardian ad Litem Program. Thus by the use of lay citizens who are aware of the operations of our Court, I feel we are a much better institution and communicate effectively with the general community.

- 2 -

The Juvenile Court has a fine and strong working relationship with Safe Landing. In fact, we have a contract and give them operating funds from our Department of Youth Services grant money. The use of such services for runaway youth has certainly been a big factor in our being in compliance with the Juvenile Justice Act.

I went back to 1974 to check on our runaway referrals and found that in 1974 we had 794 referrals for runaway, which was approximately 10 percent of our overall court referrals.

The following is a list of such referrals through 1987. As you can see, in 1987 we had 321 referrals or approximately 6 percent of overall court referrals.

REFERRALS FOR RUNAWAY TO SUMMIT COUNTY JUVENILE COURT

1974 - 793 (Approximately 10% of overall court referrals)
'75 - 769
'76 - 571
'77 - 530
'78 - 510
'79 - 364
'80 - 324
'81 - 278
'82 - 261
'83 - 187
'84 - 223
'85 - 256
'86 - 240
'87 - 321 (Approximately 6% of overall court referrals)

An additional 225 are handled as non-logged court referrals, and were diverted to community agencies for help and deemed not appropriate for Court action.

We not only have been able to experience a decline in referrals to the court but by the use of Safe Landing we only detained 17 runaways in secure custody in 1987; 6 of these being out-of-county children. In checking the 17 individual children that were detained there were other delinquency referrals in addition to the runaway, in about every case.

I certainly can vouch that having this runaway shelter is a very valuable service to our children; not only for the purpose of diverting them from the Juvenile Justice System but, also, keeping runaway children from being placed in secure custody. I assure you, our handling of such children is only possible because of having Safe Landing for these children. I, also, assure you that I have a close personnal relationship with this agency and can vouch that its success is the result of fine, dedicated workers such as David Fair and his staff. I have seen the community develop this same confidence over the years. My own intake staff and all of the police units in Summit County now refer such children directly to Safe Landing and not to Juvenile Court and detention. It is certainly reassuring that there is a humane, competent service for these families with a crisis.

I feel that this is one program where Federal funds have been a proven success, and these runaway programs such as Safe Landing are intervening in young peoples lives at a early and crucial stage and they need the fiscal resources to do it. The tremendous community support in Summit County and the services connected to best help young people is a very positive and humane way should offer you assurance that you certainly are a large part of a solution to a crucial problem.

- 4 -

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much, Judge, for your testimony.

I have some questions here. I will address maybe the first question to Joe here. If his mother wants to join in the answer, too, that will be fine.

Ms. KLEON. OK.

Mr. KILDEE. Joe, how long were you at the Safe Landing Shelter?

Mr. KLEON. A little less than 2 weeks.

Mr. KILDEE. A little less than 2 weeks there. Is that the usual stay? Do you try to move them back into the family situation by that time?

Mr. FAIR. Yes. There is a maximum length of stay of 15 days. Usually the average stay is about 9 days.

Mr. KILDEE. OK. Joe, if you were to—it is a difficult question because you have already indicated the things that they helped you with there, but if you were to pick out the one that was most important when you went there, how would you describe that to this committee?

Mr. KLEON. I think the most important thing was that we were not forced to stay there. I mean, if we wanted to just get up and walk back out on the street, we could go out the door, and they let us know that they were there if we wanted the help, and I cannot remember anybody leaving when I was there.

It was not the kind of atmosphere where we were forced to stay there, which would probably make a lot of people reject the center.

Judge KANNEL. That is——

Mr. KILDEE. He is not a lawyer, but he put his finger on the basic problem.

Judge KANNEL. That is a tremendous point, you know. This whole argument of secured custody, and it was borne out to me in the past years that I spent hearing these cases, and I knew very well that these kids did not need secured custody.

The problem was a crisis in their home, and what we used to do was lock the kid up and then have a hearing and treat him as a delinquent, but, you see, Joe is not going to run away from any place but home, until that problem was solved.

So, the crisis was in the home and you needed to resolve that temporary crisis, and I think that reiterates the whole philosophy here that they do not need secured custody in many cases.

Now, I am not saying that is all cases, but in most cases.

Mr. KILDEE. Without being a lawyer or a lawmaker, you have put your finger on the very philosophy of this law very well. I am glad I asked you that question to help establish this record.

Ms. KLEON. I would like to say that the time I had and he had away from each other gave us the time to really look at our problem. He was not in the home, so I could look at the problem. He was away and he could look at his problems.

So, bringing us together with the problem in that two weeks time was very crucial, and had Juvenile Court made me take him back home that night, the problem would not have gotten solved because he would have been back in the home and he would not—he would have been doing the same thing he was doing before.

So, the 2 weeks is a crucial time for them to be there and it does help.

Mr. KILDEE. So, it provided some time for reflection and maybe some respite, too, right?

Ms. KLEON. Right.

Mr. KILDEE. Where you could begin to think about it.

Ms. KLEON. Right. That is right.

Judge KANNEL. And I would suspicion that probably Mrs. Kleon at that time was upset that we did not lock her son up. I mean, parents are frustrated——

Ms. KLEON. Yes, I was.

Judge KANNEL [continuing]. And it makes for a difficult situation.

Ms. KLEON. Yes, I was.

Judge KANNEL. And they feel very strongly, well, you have got ahold of him, you have got to lock him up and you have got to do this. But after reflection, she sees that what was needed in this situation.

Mr. KILDEE. Joe, one other question. How well known on the street, when you were out on the street, is the existence of a place like this? Do most of the young people——

Mr. KLEON. It is known to most of the people. I have known people in the past that have stayed there and, you know, people know that it is there.

Mr. KILDEE. OK.

Mr. KLEON. I am not really necessarily saying that somebody that hits the street is going to first go there, you know, because that is just the philosophy of the young person, you know. If they are going to go out on the street, they are going to do it themselves.

But I know a lot of friends that have stayed there and a lot of people that the program has really helped.

Mr. FAIR. If I could just comment on that, too. We have a lot of referrals come from agencies and police departments, but still the dominant source of referrals at Safe Landing is the walk-in. The youngster that just comes in on his or her own volition and walks in.

Mr. KLEON. And they do make the program known. I remember going through junior high and high school a few times having representatives from Safe Landing come into the schools and just tell us that the service was available if we needed it and, you know, gave us brochures and told us where it was at and said if we needed a place, that it was there for us.

Mr. KILDEE. Dave, if someone would come to you where there was no family, the homeless part of the Runaway and Homeless Youth, how would you deal with that? If there was someone who really had no home to return to, are you prepared to refer to another agency where they could help them become prepared for independent living?

Mr. FAIR. We really are. Staff works at the very beginning, from the intake interview on, to find a good placement. We would never turn a youngster out to some place that we did not feel was a good resource.

About probably around thirty percent of the young people coming into the Safe Landing, I know figures do not mean everything, but do not return to the same place that they came from.

Some go to Children's Services, some might go to a relative resource or a foster home or something like that.

But we would help find a place and that is one of the reasons why working together with other agencies is so essential. We just cannot be all things to all kids, and we do not try to be that, and, so, it is important that we network with other agencies who can do the things that we cannot do.

Mr. KILDEE. One additional question and I will turn to Mr. Sawyer and then come back to another round of questions.

Mrs. Kleon mentioned that that period of time gave her some time to reflect and maybe some respite, too. Were you in contact with her during that time helping her in this situation?

Mr. FAIR. We really are a family program, as Judge Kannel said. I think within—we endeavor as much as possible within the first 48 hours of admission to have a family session, where we ask the family to come in, and in most cases, they do, and in most cases, we try to put our finger on the problem and bring reconciliation to that situation.

Ms. KLEON. When I did not—when Juvenile Courts tried to contact me, when they had picked him up, when I did not answer the phone all night because I did not want him back home at that point, when I put the phone back on the hook in the morning at 7, Safe Landing was on the phone to tell me that Joe was there and say he could stay there.

I did not wait for them to contact me to come down. I went down there on my own. I wanted to see the place. I wanted to see where he was staying, and they welcomed—opened up the door and welcomed me and showed me the whole place and explained everything to me.

So, that is how I—but they do contact you. They definitely do.

Judge KANNEL. You know, they do not really need us on this panel.

Mr. KILDEE. Judge, we need all of you obviously, but, you know, it is interesting, very often we do just talk to those who provide the service and do not talk enough to those who have received the service, and they really give a dimension to these hearings that is very valuable.

Tom.

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you very much, Dale.

First let me mention a couple of other people who have come in. Joe White, who is the director of Summit County Children's Services Board, and City Prosecutor Gary Rosen, who is with us this morning.

Joe, can you tell us a little bit about the folks that you met, the staff people and the people who were working at Safe Landing when you first arrived and throughout your stay there?

Mr. KLEON. About what they were about or what they were like?

Mr. SAWYER. Yeah. Give us a sense of who you encountered, what was there, and what kind of services you got.

Mr. KLEON. Well, as I said, they spent a lot of time developing me, you know, developing the positive aspects of the individuals, and they really spent more time listening really than they did anything else and let us bring out our feelings, and, you know, just by having somebody there to listen really does make a difference be-

cause it takes all those feelings that you had locked up inside and lets you bring them out in the open and deal with them and that is really the majority of what they did there.

Mr. SAWYER. Were there people available to you there virtually all the time?

Mr. KLEON. Yes. Twenty-four hours a day, there was always somebody there that if you needed to talk to somebody or anything, somebody was always there.

Mr. SAWYER. Dave, how do you put together a staff at a facility like this? What kind of training do they get, the professional and volunteer help that you have, in order to make an organization like this go?

Mr. FAIR. Really, we have had very little difficulty finding, training good staff in this area. Most of our staff come from the Akron or Summit County area. Many have gone to school here at Akron University, Kent State University, and we look for staff that are motivated in this direction to work with troubled kids, and we train them and give them a lot of help, but I think one of the important things, and this is true of the Juvenile Court, too, I have noticed over the years, there is not much of a turnover in our staff.

So, people stay a long time and they—I think this kind of work grows on you a little bit, and once in awhile, we get burned out but we help each other when that happens.

Mr. SAWYER. That is a remarkable testimony for Safe Landing. Nationally, the turnover is really quite high. I guess the average stay is somewhere in the neighborhood of 18 months for professional staff.

Can you talk a little bit about the kinds of salaries you are able to pay in a setting like that?

Mr. FAIR. Well, my staff would appreciate your asking that question. We—our salaries, we have some entry level positions that are still under $15,000 a year, and then our counselor positions are—most of our positions at Safe Landing would be under $20,000 a year, for people with master's degrees, and nearly all of our staff have at least a bachelor's degree, and complementing the staff at Safe Landing, we have a corps of volunteers.

We probably have in the course of a month, 30 or 40 different people volunteering, shifts like this, and that is a—at one point, we were one of the few agencies at Summit County to have a waiting list of volunteers to be trained, and we could not use them all at one time, and that is not true right now.

We are looking for volunteers, but we have a tremendous support there.

Mr. SAWYER. In your experience, is this a typical pattern throughout the state or across the country?

Mr. FAIR. We have a very strong network of runaway shelters here in the State of Ohio, and Sally Maxton will tell you, but in my opinion, this seems to be pretty much the case all over, too.

I am not sure that they have the same experience in terms of finding and keeping staff, but I think it is true.

Mr. SAWYER. One of the concerns that we had had was the data that we had heard nationally about salary levels, where often entry level positions were being paid at $11,000 to $12,000 a year, and that in some cases, the work placements for the kids who were

ready to leave a shelter setting and go into a work assignment would wind up with salaries in fast food places that were higher than those of the degree-holding counselors that had been able to place them there.

That is a matter of real concern. When you go about developing the kind of funding that makes it possible for this kind of stability and staff and level of training, where do you turn? How do you go about getting the kinds of grants that it takes to supplement public funds?

Mr. FAIR. Well, I do not mean to mislead you. We have struggled to get to this point, and we are not where we would like to be yet in terms of the salary ranges and that type of thing.

All of our staff, in my opinion, are underpaid for what they do and give, and I think we have sought funding through, as Judge Kannel has said, the House bill 440, that comes through the Department of Youth Services to our Juvenile Court. We have gotten funding from them.

We have gotten funding through our local Children's Services Board. That has been a real help and we have an excellent working relationship with them, and we have gotten some monies from contributions, as I mentioned, and local agencies like that, and recently we have gotten some monies through the Mental Health Board through the Emergency Service Control Network that they have just established.

Those are all local dollars. That is our four primary sources of funding. The monies through HHS, Juvenile Court, Children's Services Board, and the Mental Health Board.

Mr. SAWYER. Have you been turned down for grants?

Mr. FAIR. A number of times.

Mr. SAWYER. Tell us about that kind of problem.

Mr. FAIR. Well, it seems like we are always writing grants. Some types of grants. We would like an increase, of course, in the monies we get from HHS, and we have asked for an increase the last three years, but have not been granted that.

In fact, we received a decrease because at one point, because there was not enough money, and we understand this because they are going to start up a new program and that type of thing.

It would be really helpful to us if there was a stable amount of money that could be earmarked for already-existing programs because that really is needed.

Mr. SAWYER. You have talked, both you, Dave, and Judge Kannel, have talked about the kind of community support that makes this kind of program possible.

Have you encountered any kind of community resistance along the way?

Mr. FAIR. One small area, Tom, and that is in zoning. Whenever you try to locate a runaway shelter in some neighborhood, everybody wants it but not next door to me. And that has been the only problem, but I cannot say that has been a real problem.

We have had a lot of support from the leadership of the City of Akron, and I think we have two good locations in Akron.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you, Tom.

To follow up on some of those questions, what is your annual budget for your program?

Mr. FAIR. Our annual budget for this current fiscal year is $480,000.

Mr. KILDEE. And how many full-time staff people do you have?

Mr. FAIR. I think we have—and staff here could probably correct me on that, I think we have probably in the neighborhood of about fifteen full-time staff and probably about nine part-time staff.

Mr. KILDEE. OK. And the Federal dollar is one part of your budget. What percentage of your budget would the Federal dollar be?

Mr. FAIR. Fifteen percent.

Mr. KILDEE. Fifteen percent. And that 15 percent is quite critical, right, if you were to lose it?

Mr. FAIR. That is $64,000.

Mr. KILDEE. $64,000. OK. Judge Kannel. there are those who would argue that the local police agencies should have authority to detain runaways, even lock them up until their parents come and get them.

Would you care to comment on that?

Judge KANNEL. Well, no, I certainly would be glad to comment on it, and I do not think—here again, I do not think you will find that is true in Summit County. Now, that is because of a long history of communication between the police and the courts.

Going back as long as I have been with the court, I can tell you that the old battles with the police department and the slapping on the wrist and not doing anything as far as Juvenile Court used to be prevalent, but the police units in Summit County recognize that we are the court, we have the responsibility, and by a liaison with them, I have one man on my staff who is a court police liaison, so that if there is any problems that they might have or any information they want to get on a particular case or they have a person to contact, and we have a very close communication.

And as a result, as I said before, as a result of Safe Landing getting credibility, the police actually are taking children to Safe Landing, and when they bring them to the Juvenile Court, they recognize that our intake has a responsibility to hold or release that child, and if we take him to Safe Landing or return them home, it is our responsibility.

I feel very strongly that the court should control their intake and should have the authority to hold or release a child, especially in the status area, and we are having no real—in fact, in status offenders, we have a court rule that they are not admitted to detention without the intake worker or the court worker getting ahold of a referee or a judge, and we are available 24 hours a day, and explaining to that referee or the judge why this child should be placed in secured custody.

And then, if the child is placed in secured custody, there is a hearing the next morning before the chief referee. So, we not only control it and that has to be communicated to the police. You just cannot arbitrarily take that position and our juvenile bureau, we work very closely with them, and the lieutenant on that serves on many community committees and is active in the community and it is really not a big problem and it should not be a big problem.

I think that, as I say, Joe brought it out better than anybody could, that I was not forced to stay there, and he started to take a look at himself and started to realize that you lock them up as a delinquent, you would treat them as a delinquent, you adjudicate them, you go through that process, and the hostility continues to build in the system for the young Joes that are out there.

Here is a situation where he was not forced to stay and somebody started to talk to him about himself and he took a look at himself and he and his mother resolved their problems.

Mr. KILDEE. All right, Joe. If you had been locked up at another time, another system, another place, do you think your life might be quite different now?

Mr. KLEON. Yes, I think it would be a lot different.

Mr. KILDEE. So, this was a very important part of your life, the way you were treated there, the fact that your mother was able to come in and talk to people, this helped.

You are in your, what, second year of college, you told me?

Mr. KLEON. Yes. A lot of times, when you are forced to do anything, there is that resistance. You know, just because of actually being forced to do this, but if it is on a personal choice, I think it makes a big difference.

Judge KANNEL. I will say that, you know, there are some situations in runaway children where it becomes kind of an impossibility. They may run from Safe Landing, they may run from Children's Services Board. They are running and hurting themselves in that situation.

In some situations, you are going to have to, after trying these other programs, you are going to have to hold this child, get their attention, and especially within the 5 days. We have a 5-day limit in Ohio for holding a status offender, and, but, that is after trying other resources and other facilities and other means.

Mr. KILDEE. Apparently, between the police and the courts and a place like Safe Landing, here in Summit County, there has been a buildup of credibility and respect that makes the system work.

Judge KANNEL. That is exactly right, and I do not know whether I got it across in my remarks, but that is—from my experience, that is because of working with the community. Having the Junior League start this process was really very helpful.

In those early days, the police were really reluctant to have any of these facilities started, you know, who is doing it, and some of the people that wanted to start them should not have been in the business themselves.

By involving the community, the lay people and the citizens in the community, you are going to have stronger institutions, you are going to have stronger courts. When my Woman's Board can conduct tours through the Juvenile Court Center, the detention facility, I know that it is a good facility. It is open to the public, and by being open to the public and having them involved, you are going to have a stronger institution and by involving the community and the police in this Safe Landing and the advisory boards and the people that are from the Junior League and people that have been involved, it just is no problem in developing the credibility.

Ms. KLEON. I would like to add something about the police.

Mr. KILDEE. Yes, go ahead.

Ms. KLEON. When I did not have anywhere to turn when he left, I—the police were very helpful with me. They told me what to do and when I established where he was, I called them and they came and they picked him up, and they were very helpful.

They advised me more or less on what course to take and how to handle it. So, yes, they were helpful, very helpful.

Mr. KILDEE. It is important in the community that you develop that credibility and respect between the various agencies, the police agency, the courts, and those service agencies, and it does not happen in every community.

Judge KANNEL. In fact, we have several what we call police youth bureaus in Summit County. Several years ago, when a new chief came into office, he called me and said, "Judge, I'd like to start a police youth program." And, so, he brought in his man and we actually trained this fellow for six months in the court so that he knew what they should handle and they should not handle, and, so, they developed a program of handling a lot of minor situations within the community itself without even coming to the Juvenile Court.

Well, when that first started, all the police chiefs were looking down their nose. What is this, and it was not too long until they were all asking for the same program.

Now, we have, I think, about eight police youth bureaus in Summit County. It does not work in the larger communities, but in the smaller communities and they have a police officer and a youth worker that do a lot of the minor situations.

The mayor of Stow, the council of Stow, the citizens of Stow, you could not take the program away from them. It is accepted and it is very well coordinated with us so that they know what they should refer to the Juvenile Court and what they should not and, so, it is another diversion-type program involving the police in helping these kids in their communities. They are in—that police officer or the youth officer is in the schools constantly doing training programs, talking to the kids, and developing a relationship between the police and the schools.

Mr. KILDEE. Tom, do you have any additional questions?

Mr. SAWYER. Just a couple. One for the Judge or virtually anyone on the panel.

If we were to do more in terms of outreach, communication across the community, in an attempt to make clear the options that are available to kids earlier in their odyssey away from home, how would we best do that? Where we would best direct our effort?

Mr. FAIR. I think probably there is no one single place, Tom, but I think that if a place like Safe Landing has a little higher visibility than maybe even we have had and have now, that would help a lot.

I think the best communication that takes place in a community is when kids tell other kids and that sort of thing, and then, when a young person is just out on the streets for a time and maybe they are picked up by the police or something, the police—there is the kind of relationship there that they can make it.

But I think it is important to have a high visibility, and when we first started, we wondered if that was good, if we would not encour-

age runaways if we had too high a visibility. We found that that is not the case.

Mr. SAWYER. And, finally, if we were able to bring more dollars directly, how would you spend those dollars, first, in a program of high quality like this?

Mr. FAIR. Yes. There are several things that we would do immediately. We would like to have a little better after-care program where we could stay in touch for just a brief period of time even with some of the young people who come through Safe Landing.

We have a policy that the young person cannot come back to Safe Landing for sixty days except for a 24-hour crisis period and that sort of thing, and I think sometimes we need a little more time than 15 days to do some of the things, and we would certainly do that.

I think we would offer a couple of things like maybe a parenting skills course. A lot of parents would like to be just plugged into it for a little time, to give them some help when they are struggling with some things.

I think we would also maybe increase the number of staff slightly and certainly increase the compensation.

Judge KANNEL. Of course, I think one thing in that area is that the increased amount of money would help do the programs that they are doing now much better because it has been diluted.

We have opened this new home. We have got two homes. That takes increased costs, the cost of living, and actually I do not think HHS funds have kept up, in fact, as Dave said, give the same amount of money, less money, than they got before.

So, I think it is important that just an increase to continue the high value programs that Dave is running now would be very, very helpful.

Mr. SAWYER. Joe, you have been on the street. Are we even coming close to touching the need, reaching the kids?

Mr. KLEON. Yes, I think you are.

Mr. SAWYER. In terms of numbers?

Mr. KLEON. Well, it seems like the whole time I was there, the place was pretty well filled up, and it seems like they are always bringing people in and just anybody that is willing to come in and willing to receive the help, they are receiving it.

Mr. SAWYER. Judge, in your point of view.

Judge KANNEL. Well, it is a very, very hard thing to measure in this situation. This runaway thing has gone up and down statistically. It is not nearly as bad as it was in the early seventies and the late sixties.

But, no, I am sure that there are a lot of family problems out there that we are not reaching and hopefully we are doing a good job with the ones that are coming in, but there is probably a need for a lot of kids out there that we are not handling.

Mr. SAWYER. Dave?

Mr. FAIR. Last year, the Akron Police, this is not the county police, but the Akron Police had 2,300 missing persons reports on children under the age of 18 here. The national network suggests that for every reported missing child, there is at least one more that is not reported.

So, that would be close to 5,000 in our own community here, if you added Summit County to that.

We are really attempting to meet the need in that way, but I think that the higher visibility we get, the greater we see the need is.

Mr. SAWYER. You can see, Mr. Chairman, why we have taken the pride in this community in the work that has been done.

Mr. KILDEE. Yes. Let me ask just one more question.

I noticed coming in from the airport from Cleveland last night, that you have several expressways that bi-sect and come through Akron here.

Do you find many young people coming from other areas? Did you seen on the street, Joe, when you were out there, young people from other towns passing through Akron and in need of services like that? Joe or Dave?

Mr. FAIR. Well, this is not meant to be an indictment against our community, but not many kids run through Akron. We do not deal with many out of town kids.

Judge KANNEL. We usually have out of county kids that are passing through and happen to get picked up.

Mr. KILDEE. It is usually Chicago or New York or Los Angeles that people run to I find.

Judge KANNEL. Las Vegas, San Francisco, Miami.

Mr. KILDEE. Sometimes they follow sun, too.

So, primarily then, you are serving people from this area of Summit County that you are serving here, and those are the people you saw on the streets, right, Joe?

Mr. KLEON. Yes.

Mr. KILDEE. This panel has been extremely helpful. We have had a lot of hearings, but I tell you, I learned some very positive things and also got some sensitivity that I had not had before. It has been very, very helpful to us. It will be helpful to us as we go back to Washington now, Tom and I, to reauthorize this legislation.

Judge KANNEL. Well, let me say this. I keep calling him Tom. Congressman Sawyer.

Mr. SAWYER. You always have. I do not know why you would change now.

Judge KANNEL. He has been a big part of this. He had some experience with the Department of Youth Services when he was a very, very young person. He has—he was instrumental in all of the Juvenile Justice Acts when he was in the state legislature, and he told me this morning, and I feel guilty, he visited Columbia Hills, one of our institutions here in the last week, and I have not been there for a couple of years, but that is the kind of interest that he has always had and he deserves a lot of credit for many of the things that we have here in Summit County because he has always had a very intense interest in this area of juvenile justice.

So, we certainly appreciate it. When I can sit down and talk with Tom, we can talk as though we are almost peers in this area because his background is very good. His interest is very good.

Mr. KILDEE. I thank this panel very, very much.

Our next panel will consist of the Honorable Jane L. Campbell, State Representative, Cleveland, Ohio.

Jane Yackshaw, director of the Safe Space Station, Cleveland, OH.

And Sally Maxton, executive director of the Ohio Youth Services Network, Columbus, OH.

And Midge Marangi.

If they can come forward. From New Horizons Shelter.

[Pause.]

Mr. KILDEE. Ms. Campbell, I spent 10 years in the Michigan House of Representatives, and I enjoyed my years there immensely.

Mr. SAWYER. Time off for good behavior.

Mr. KILDEE. I spent half a term in the U.S. Senate. I see our former State Senator Ocasek has left right now, but I always tell this, that in the House, I was Dale to everybody. The elevator operator called me Dale. My secretary called me Dale. When I got to the Senate, I never heard my first name again, you know. So, the House has always had good humility and good people.

STATEMENT OF HON. JANE L. CAMPBELL, STATE REPRESENTATIVE, CLEVELAND, OH

Ms. CAMPBELL. Thank you, Congressman.

Mr. KILDEE. You may proceed.

Ms. CAMPBELL. Would you like me to start?

Mr. KILDEE. Whatever order you want. You can decide among yourselves.

Ms. CAMPBELL. Very well.

Good morning, Congressmen.

I appreciate the opportunity to come and share our thoughts. I serve in the legislature and as the vice-chair of the Committee on Children and Youth, and am currently also vice-chair of the Select Committee we have that has been exploring child abuse and juvenile justice, and it is partly in that context that I come to encourage you to act as rapidly as you can on this reauthorization measure.

We did in the last budget for the first time appropriate a small amount of money, of State money, for runaway shelters, and I can tell you that it was difficult at best and we came up with the grand total of a $100,000, which you can imagine does not go very far, and, so, if people think that perhaps the State legislature can pick up the slack, that simply is not the case.

Now, I would like to share with you some particular thoughts in terms of the funding formula and the State grants. We have used the state grants, we think, wisely in the State of Ohio, and have been able to fund some innovative programs involving jail removal, deinstitutionalization, and really recommend that 83 percent of the block grant funds be earmarked for state block grants.

With regard to jail removal, I do not know if you have had a status update on how we have done in terms of jail removal here in the State. Ohio has gone from about 6,000 youth being held in adult jails to only 300 youth, and those 300 youth are only in two counties, and we have, as the committee—the Select Committee has now introduced legislation to disallow having any children held in adult jails, and, so, just those two counties would have to come into conformity, and, so, we would recommend that as you look at

the reauthorization, the proposal I understand is that you have $3 million set-aside for those states to come into compliance, and what we would like to encourage you is to say that if the States have already come into compliance or can show that they will come into compliance by 1988 or 1989, that we can be permitted to use our share of that money for different projects and so that you do not end up penalizing people who did what was right but did it before the funding was available.

With regard to title III, the Runaway Youth Act, which is certainly the highest priority of many of the individuals here, and I can tell you that I have the privilege of representing the area where the Safe Space Shelter is in Cleveland, and we have people who can tell you much better than I about what Safe Space does, but it is an extremely valuable institution, and we would recommend that you earmark 95 percent of the Runaway Youth Act money for basic center grants.

We would also encourage that you look at what is happening to the centers. As there are more centers created, which is important and we want to have these kinds of services, you end up having less money for each center that has been there all along, and, so, I would encourage you to look at what are we doing in that area and so that we can allow the centers that have been operating to know that they can have some basic amount that they can count on, that they will also be able to have some amount so that they able to grow because certainly their expenses grow with inflation and also the more they are known, the more they are used because there are kids that say, you know, they were not provided good service and that gets—the word gets out.

And, so, we want to provide a way to protect our existing shelters while new shelters are being developed, so that you do not have the situation where the existing shelters are having to compete with the new shelters directly for those grants.

Finally, I am sorry, I have got a cold, I sound strange. I hope you can understand me. I hope you can hear me. Just suffice it to say.

The other area is the area of status offenders, and what I understand is that this area has been fairly well neglected since 1980 when the Ashbrook Amendment, which stated that status offenders who violated a valid court order would be classified delinquent and could be held in detention, one of the things we have learned in the Select Committee is that violating a court order or being—doing a repeat offense, you know, being repeatedly unruly, has classified some of those youngsters as delinquent and has gotten them into being held in custody. In some instances in Ohio, it has even brought them into the Department of Youth Services and institutions.

And we need to take another look at that, and so that we do not have people who are really status offenders being held in our institutions, and we would recommend that in your bill, you limit the time a youth can be held in detention for violating a valid court order to only fifteen days, and so that we do not see our youth being held in, you know, with people who have actually dealt with major violent activities. We do not want to mix up the two, if that is possible.

Mr. KILDEE. I shall ever remember the evening when Mr. Ashbrook and I had a difference on the House floor. I remember that very well.

Ms. CAMPBELL. Very well. But I am sure that you know the statistical background about what the extent of the problem is that we are dealing with, but let me just remind you that in Ohio, it is estimated that 55,000 youth runaway from home each year, and that of the youth that are seen by our shelters, 44 percent of those are youngsters who come out of self-referrals or come by being referred to the family, and as we understand better the situation of these children, and are able to ask some of the difficult questions that were not previously asked, we are finding that an extraordinarily large number of these youngsters are suffering abuse at home, very often suffering sexual abuse at home.

If we had the opportunity to intervene appropriately in their lives, when they come for assistance, we will be able to help them to structure a productive life, and we will not have such a risk that they will be potentially long-term trouble-makers, that they will be people who suffer serious mental health problems that are not corrected and the questions are not asked at the young age, and, so, this is really a very important thing for those of us in Ohio.

This is something—this is an area where there has been a strong partnership between the Federal and the State Government in our activities and I would simply encourage you to try and continue that partnership and pledge to you that we will continue our part and look forward to working with you.

Thank you very much.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much.

Jane.

Ms. YACKSHAW. Yackshaw.

Mr. KILDEE. OK. Yackshaw.

STATEMENT OF JANE YACKSHAW, DIRECTOR, SAFE SPACE STATION, CLEVELAND, OH

Ms. YACKSHAW. I would like to start out first by just citing two typical cases that have come to Safe Space within the last year.

We had a young girl, 15 year old, named Monique who came to Safe Space fleeing from her father, who was a cocaine dealer, and like most cocaine dealers and users, he was fairly violent and he was violent toward her.

She fled her home. She came to Safe Space. Within hours of her coming to Safe Space, we sent her to the Free Clinic, which is our parent agency, so she could get an exam to treat her injuries, to do abuse documentation, and at the same time, her parents and her parents' friends were repeatedly calling our shelter trying to discredit the kid.

They called up saying she is mentally ill, we have arranged for immediate treatment in a psych ward. Then, we started getting calls from people claiming they were psychiatrists or social workers, an intake worker, an ambulance driver, we are on our way to pick her up, we are going to be transporting her.

We were real suspicious about this. We checked with the psych hospital that they allegedly had set up admission for, and found out that that was bogus, that just simply was not true.

The father of Monique showed up at Safe Space a few hours later. He was intoxicated on cocaine. He was demanding his daughter. By that time, his daughter was back at Safe Space, having finished with her medical care. We put her in another part of the shelter while some of our staff met with the father, allowed him to vent his anger, while others of our staff got on the phone to our protective children's services to ask for an emergency custody so the kid could not be removed.

We did get emergency custody of this kid through DHS. We had the father, after some venting, leave Safe Space, and she spent about ten days or so at Safe Space getting counselling to help her deal with, you know, her parents' outrageous behavior, to help her understand why her parents would be acting that way, to help her learn to adjust to a new living situation.

We also used that time to go to court, get the court to confirm a custody change, and search out relative placement. The kid is now with her grandmother in another city.

Another kid, and this is more—who is more typical of a family reunification, this was a young boy named Aaron, 16 years old, who showed up at Safe Space, after having been on the run for a few days.

He ran from home because his father had slapped him around. Dad had just lost it one day. You know, the kid repeatedly was violating curfew, cutting school, Dad was at his wit's end, and slapped the kid around. Kid booked, ended up at a runaway shelter because the parents of his friends refused to allow him to stay in the home without parental permission.

When Aaron walked into Safe Space, we got the sense that he initially just wanted to hide from his problems and we made sure that he understood if he was going to stay at Safe Space, we expected him, you know, although we would serve in the role of advocating to his father that violence not be used as discipline, we expected Aaron to come through on his own responsibilities, attend school, observe the house rules.

We worked with Aaron for about a week, had his parents come in several times, and did some family sessions with them, sent the kid home with the whole family agreeing to a contract that laid out basic rules, that laid out consequences, appropriate discipline that would occur if those rules were broken.

Those are two real typical case histories that we get at Safe Space in Cleveland.

I have been running Safe Space for the last seventeen months and only this week, I am stepping down. I am needed in another position at the Free Clinic, and the old director, Rebecca DeVenanzio, who is here, I do not know where she is at the moment, she will be coming back to direct Safe Space.

John Lawson, our station attorney, he represents our kids, he is also here with us.

As far as I know, we are the only runaway shelter that does have a full-time attorney to represent our kids.

You know, I—when I came on as director and for the last 17 months, I have found myself dealing with a skeleton staff that is overworked, that is underpaid, that works outrageously long hours for which I cannot pay them overtime. In order for them to make ends meet, they have to hold down a second job or if they do not do that, they just live paycheck to paycheck, just barely.

I find myself running a shelter that is overwhelmed with kids. We draw most of our residents—come from Cuyahoga County's population, which is about a million and a half folks. For eight of the seventeen months that I was director, we were the only runaway shelter in town, serving these kids. Cleveland has an outrageous number of runaways and we have been very overwhelmed.

I am—typically, I just want to throw out a typical staff person to you. His name is Jeff. He is a youth worker at Safe Space. He has been with us for a year. He works the evening shift, 3 to 11 and he is responsible for training and coordinating volunteers, for overseeing all the youth who are in the shelter, their behavior, any crisis that may occur among those youth.

He is responsible for manning the phones, handling any crisis that walks in the door or that comes over the telephone. He is responsible for ensuring that the utilities are working, that there is food in the place. He is responsible for doing intakes on new residents. He is a busy guy as are most of my staff.

I pay this guy $10,000 a year. March 9th is his 1-year anniversary here. The guy deserves a raise and I do not know where I am going to get the money to give that raise. He works parttime at another runaway shelter so he can make ends meet, and I expect either I am going to lose this guy real soon because he cannot possibly maintain this amount of work and this amount of stress for such little monetary reward, or I expect him to burn out and just simply become ineffective because he is working too hard.

My problem is I cannot help him either because I do not have the money to pay him the money that he deserves. Just like I cannot pay any of my staff what they need and what they work for.

We get allocated $82,000 in Federal funds. Our budget is $275,000 a year. So, the Federal funds make up about one-third of our income. The way that we obtain the other two-thirds of that income, about a third of that, we try to obtain from contracts that we have with our Juvenile Court and our Department of Human Services. When they have kids in their custody who need temporary placement while awaiting more long-term placement or treatment, they will place them at Safe Space, if we have the room, and they will pay us $45 or $50 a day to keep that kid.

The other one-third of the money that we use to operate Safe Space is what we raise from foundations and corporations in the area and what we get from individual donations. It is what gets thrown in the donation can.

We—a big dilemma here is the contracts that we have with our DHS and our Juvenile Court because that sets up a real conflict there. Here we are a crisis shelter for youth, designed to work best with and see those kids who are in crisis. Kids who have lived with family and things get hot and they need to be separated or the kid runs away or the kid is being abused and needs some safety.

Those are the kids we were designed to see. Those are the kids that runaway shelters were intended for. However, all I get for them is $82,000 a year from the Federal Government. To do that service.

Then, I have these kids that I can make fifty bucks a day for. They are not kids in crisis. They are kids awaiting placement. They are not kids in a dangerous situation. They are not kids who are homeless.

Constantly, I have this dilemma over, my God, our mission is to take youth in crisis, but if that is what I take and if that is all I take, we are going to close down. We cannot operate because we will not have the money.

But, yet, in order for me to make our budget, I have to maintain four of those paying kids per day at Safe Space. Unfortunately, usually we try to do both, but what happens is that there are periods of time, especially those eight months when we were the only runaway shelter in Cleveland, when there was such an overwhelming demand in terms of the youth in crisis that we were unable to accept these paying referrals, and what we ended—what ended up happening is we are having a real problem this year meeting our budget because we lost money. We lost what we expected to get from those paying kids coming via court and DHS.

For years, we have had the choice. For years, we have just tried to do both, and I do not know how long we can maintain doing that.

Another problem that I would like to speak to besides that dilemma is the high turnover that I have among staff. We have a real problem with that. I pay—I started—I pay my youth workers between $9,000 and $11,000 a year to perform those services that I said that staff named Jeff performed. Tremendous range of services they have to perform for $9,000 to $11,000 a year.

I can pay my counsellors, the resident counsellors who are working directly with that youth and the family, I pay them between $11,000 and $13,000 a year. It is just—I do not have any more money to pay them. That is it. Those are—that is the amount of money that I can afford.

I have a real problem with turnover because there is only so long that the staff can work for that low pay and those long hours without burning out. It is real discouraging for the staff to be working an average of ten hours a day, to be called all through the weekend about their kids, to be subjected to the kind of stress that they get when they are on site, and to be wondering how they are going to pay—make a car payment or how they are going to pay an electric bill. It is just too much and they end up leaving. They end up burning out, becoming ineffective or quitting because someone else offered them $2,000 or $3,000 more and that is what they need to meet their daily living.

When this turnover occurs, when I get these resignations, a whole range of things impact Safe Space in a real negative way. You are losing valuable experienced staff. Ok. When you bring on new staff, your current staff will have to divert their time to train those new folks. That means that they are going to have less time to do direct service.

Also during that period of time when I am searching for new staff and when we are breaking in new staff, I am taking less kids because I do not have enough people to pay attention to them.

Also on the new staff, when they—first of all, I have a very difficult time finding new staff with the amount of money that I pay. Who wants to—who, with those skills, is willing to work those kind of hours under that kind of stress for 10 grand a year? $13,000 tops.

We have spent months sometimes trying to fill counselling or youth worker positions.

Once they are filled with what we feel are quality staff, I feel that still there is a period of time during orientation and training and getting used to Safe Space that those new staff just are not providing as good a service for the clients as your experienced staff would do.

Those are the two major dilemmas that we are facing, and I assume you can see how frantic I am as I sit here before you. It is because I am very worried about how we can continue to do this needed service when I have a wired and burned out staff and when the program director is in not in that much better shape.

I am asking you for four main things. I am asking, number one, that you allocate at least 90 to 95 percent of current Runaway Youth Act funds and any increase, including this current increase that I understand has been appropriated, that that go directly to the runaway shelters that are providing the direct service.

It is runaway shelters that see the youth in crisis. It is runaway shelters that are so overwhelmed, that have such a tough time meeting the demand. It is runaway shelters that when we get, you know, this nice fancy research or when we get a demonstration project in, we do not have the time to read the research. You know, we do not have the money to continue that demonstration program beyond a year.

We believe that research and demonstration projects are necessary, but they should never ever be allowed to decrease either the quantity of the services provided or the quality, and I feel at a minimum we need 90 to 95 percent of runaway funds allocated to shelters.

I am also—the second thing that I am requesting from you, is that you increase the operational support to shelters, to individual shelters, to a level which will allow those shelters to fulfill the function they were meant to fulfill. Please do not allow us to continue in this bind of wondering, my God, you know, should I perhaps think of turning away this youth in crisis so I can take a paying kid so I can keep this place open. OK.

I mean we do not do that. We would never turn away a youth in crisis, but boy it is tough when I sit down and I look at how am I going to meet payroll. I cannot possibly give an increase. It is real tempting to start taking those paying kids over the youth in crisis, but it is the youth in crisis that we are meant to serve.

The third thing that I am asking for is I heard that there was a proposal to extend that 2-week limit. I would urge you not to extend the 2-week limit. We strongly feel that if you allow runaway shelters to routinely keep youth beyond the 14-15-day limit, that that moves those runaway shelters in the direction of being placement—just shelter care facilities rather than crisis facilities.

A crisis is something that you can resolve usually within 2 weeks. When you need to stay there longer than 2 weeks, you do not have a crisis anymore, you are looking at placement, and that is not something that runaway shelters were set up to do. They are not meant to be shelter care or placement alternatives.

The fourth thing that I would ask you to consider is to increase the basis shelter care grants to allow more comprehensive service beyond the crisis counselling and the immediate housing.

If—with such increases, what can be done is we can hire a volunteer coordinator to go out and spend full-time recruiting, training, overseeing volunteers and that right away you are extending your service in the cheapest way possible. we could hire full-time aftercare followup person who can make sure that when a kid leaves Safe Space or any other runaway shelter, that the plan that was put in place is being followed. This will help prevent repeat runners.

We believe it is cheaper to maintain a kid on an out-client basis than to maintain them as a resident, and also we believe it is easier to maintain a youth in a runaway shelter, it is cheaper to do so, than to maintain them in a group home placement or more serious long-term treatment places.

In closing, I would just like to say that I think that runaway shelters are the best program that the Federal Government is funding. Of course, I am very prejudiced here, but I feel that with a relatively paltry sum of money, $27 million or so a year, to fund all the runaway shelters across the country, you are funding programs that are effective, that work cheaply, that have no red tape for their clients to deal with, that are accessible 24-hours a day every day of the year.

We do our job and we do it well.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Jane Yackshaw follows:]

Jane Yackshaw

Testimony presented to the Subcommittee on Human Resources, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, holding hearings on H.R. 1801, on March 5, 1988, in Akron, Ohio.

Monique, a fifteen year-old daughter of a cocaine dealer in an affluent suburb of Cleveland, fled her home due to her father's violence. When she initially arrived at the Safe Space Station, staff had her checked by a medical doctor at the Free Medical Clinic of Greater Cleveland, in order to treat her medical injuries and document the abuse. The local county's Department of Human Services were notified of the alleged abuse so an investigation could begin and an emergency custody order could be obtained, if needed. Meanwhile Monique's parents and their friends were making repeated calls to Safe Space trying to discredit her. They feared that Monique would reveal the family's drug importation and dealing, along with the abuse. Repeatedly, calls were received: first from the parents, saying that Monique was mentally ill and that they had arranged for immediate admission into a psychiatric hospital; then, people called alleging that they were a psychiatrist a social worker or an intake worker at a hospital, saying that they would be coming by car to transport Monique. Station staff called the hospital directly and learned that no such admission had been arranged. The father arrived, intoxicated on cocaine, demanding his daughter. Staff were able to get Monique in the county's custody to prevent her removal from the shelter. Monique was sent to another part of the building while staff met with the father, allowed him to vent some of his anger and paranoia, and persuaded him to leave. Monique stayed at Safe Space for ten days, during which time court approved a custody change, a search was conducted to locate appropriate relative or group home placement, and counseling and drug education were provided to Monique so she could understand her parents' behavior and adjust to a new living situation. Monique is now staying with her grandmother in another city.

Aaron, a sixteen year-old son of working class parents from Cleveland's near west side, ran away from home after his father had slapped him around in a fit of anger over Aaron's repeated violations of his curfew. Aaron came to Safe Space after various friends' parents refused to allow him to stay in their homes. Station staff made clear to Aaron that, although they were willing to help him in advocating that his father not use violence as discipline, Aaron himself needed to work on meeting his own responsibilities. Aaron stayed at Safe Space for a week, meeting with a counselor daily and mapping out plans to correct his school truancy, poor grades, and tendency to stay out later than parents permitted. Two sessions were held involving the entire family, at which time Aaron's father talked of his anger at Aaron's behavior and his fear of losing control and being abusive, Aaron's mother expressed her frustration at being in the middle of a deteriorating relationship between father and son, and the entire family mapped out an agreement encompassing behavior rules, chore assignments, disciplinary methods. Aaron returned home, but continues to come to the Station for weekly aftercare counseling.

These two case histories illustrate the need for and the work done by runaway shelters such as the Safe Space Station, a program operated by the Free Medical Clinic of Greater Cleveland. I have been the director of the Station for the last seventeen months, and have worked for the clinic since 1975, variously as a crisis intervention worker, hotline director, psych intake supervisor, drug educator and volunteer trainer and supervisor. As director of Safe Space, I found myself working with a tight budget (approximately $275,000 per year), an overwhelming demand for service (1,016 youth served, including 513 residents in 1987), and a low-paid, over-worked, yet highly-dedicated staff.

A typical staff person is Jeff, who serves as a youth worker at the Station. He is expected to coordinate the volunteers, assist in training, staff the phones insure that food and needed supplies are available, monitor the behavior and

the comings-and-goings of an average of 12-14 teenagers (not ordinary teenagers, but teens in crisis) and any number of agency officials, family members and friends, and handle any crisis that occurs inhouse among the residents, or crises that come via the telephone or the doorway. He makes a $10,000 salary (no overtime pay), has worked for the Station one year, and there is a question as to the availability of funds for a raise. He works part-time at another runaway shelter to make ends meet and I expect him to burn-out and become ineffective or quit because he is burning the candle at both ends.

Safe Space's allocation from the Runaway Youth Act funds totals $82,000 a year. This allocation has not been increased in years, and in fact has decreased from a peak of $90,000. The federal funds pay about 1/3 of the cost of running Safe Space. Another 1/3 is raised via contracts the Station made with its county's Juvenile Court and Department of Human Services (DHS). The final 1/3 comes from whatever the Free Clinic and Safe Space can raise privately from foundations, corporations and individual donars. Efforts are continually made to generate such revenues, thereby maximizing the source of support.

A major funding dilemma involves the contracts with the Court and DHS. These agencies pay the Station between $45-$50 a day to temporarily house youth in their custody who are awaiting more long-term placement. The Station can only meet its annual expenses if it maintains an average of four of these "system kids" in its shelter every day. Yet youth who are in their families custody and are in the midst of a crisis are the very youth for whom Safe Space was set up to serve.

For years now, Station staff have been faced with this choice between serving youth in crisis or serving as temporary shelters for "system" youth. It has always made the choice to do both, with priority given to youth in crisis. When the shelter is overwhelmed with these self-referred or walk-in youth, it "loses" money and its survival is threatened because it must turn down reimbursable referrals. My executive director and my board consistently urge me to accept a certain percentage of "paying kids" so that the budget can be balanced and payroll can be met. An unbalanced budget means cutting expenses, laying-off staff, and providing less service despite the increasing demand. My staff are good-hearted folks, very much interested in helping youth and families in crisis. They know that the frantic parent or homeless kid calling for help are the very clients they need to take, yet the staff need to survive themselves. They long for that salary increase that was promised but is still on hold; they remember those paydays when it didn't look like payroll would be met; they sit in offices with spaceheaters going because the Station put off fixing the heaters in order to pay other bills. Sooner or later, my staff must make a choice. If they want to continue to do the work they love and that they're highly skilled at doing, they must give up basic aspirations such as owning a home, having a child, buying a new car. They won't be able to afford such things. If they refuse to give up these basic aspirations, then they will have to work two jobs to make ends meet. Or they will quit their job at Safe Space and take their skills and experience elsewhere.

Station staff receive low pay: youth workers make between $9,000 and $10,000 a year; counselors are paid between $11,000 and $13,000 annually. High turnover of staff is the unfortunate result of low pay, long hours and high stress. Loss of experienced staff is expensive for Safe Space and its clients in a number of ways:

- the Station takes in less residents due to low staffing;
- the Station loses expected income because the youth that aren't accepted are the "paying kids" in county or court custody;
- experienced staff will have to spend time training and orienting new new staff, thus limiting the number of clients they see, or expanding the number of hours they work; this leads to further burn-out and resignations among current staff;
- the Station conducts a long, frustrating search for candidates with skills and experience who are willing to work for very little money; at times it has taken months to fill a counselor or youth worker slot;

- the families and youth in crisis in the community initially receive less quality care from new staff, because new staff lack the skills which accompany experience with a particular crisis program.

I am asking you to do several things:

1. Allocate at least 90%-95% of Runaway Youth Act funds, both current funding and this latest increase, to runaway shelters. It is the shelters that are directly serving youth in crisis. It is the shelters which are desperately hurting for stable, quality staff to provide direct service. It is the shelters which have no funding to continue the demonstration projects that federal runaway funds are used to initiate. Quality care currently exists. Research, although necessary, should never diminish the quantity or quality of service offered.
2. Increase operational support to a level which will allow runaway shelters to provide the service for which they were intended. It is a conflict of interest to constantly have shelter staff put in a position of making a choice between accepting a youth in crisis or accepting a "system kid" for which the shelter will be paid.
3. Maintain the two-week limit on housing youth at runaway shelters. To allow shelters to keep youth for a longer period of time serves further to move the shelters in the direction of serving as temporary placement or sheltercare facilities rather than as crisis programs for runaway and homeless youth.
4. Increase basic shelter grants to allow more comprehensive service beyond housing and crisis counseling. Currently, runaway shelters maintain a skeleton staff which barely manages to handle immediate crises. With more funding to add staff positions for aftercare/ follow-up services and to train and supervise volunteers, shelters can provide more quality, comprehensive care, lessen staff burn-out and help to prevent repeat runners. It is cheaper to counsel a youth on an out-client basis, than to work with the youth as a runaway. It is also money well spent to address adolescent or family crises at this stage rather than later when long term placement or more serious treatment interventions may be necessary.

Runaway programs are unlike any other federal program. They do the job they were designed to do, they do it well, and they do it cheaply. They are immediately accessible, ready to provide safety and assistance at all hours of the day and night, every day of the year, with no red tape for their clients. There is no other federal program that, with only $27 million dollars, has such a potential to touch the lives in a positive, healing manner of every adolescent and every parent of an adolescent in this country. I ask you merely to help us make this federal program even more effective.

TESTIMONY SUBMITTED BY: Jane Yackshaw
Program Director
Safe Space Station
12321 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
(216) 421-2000

a program of the
Free Medical Clinic of
Greater Cleveland
12201 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
(216) 721-4010

Mr. KILDEE. I am holding up right here, I am glad I brought this, this is an Allen Wrench, which the Pentagon was charged $9,606 for. You could pay one of your staff people with that.

Ms. YACKSHAW. Right. That would pay one of my staff people for three years.

Mr. KILDEE. So, if we can stop the Pentagon from buying this type of wrench in the future, we could do some——

Ms. CAMPBELL. We can make them for the runaway shelter.

Mr. KILDEE. OK.

Ms. YACKSHAW. Or turn them out.

Mr. KILDEE. If you could sell them to the Pentagon for that. I point that out maybe just for this instance that I am sure no one at this table is bashful about asking for funds, but just in case you are ever attempted to be bashful when you think of things like this, now we all want a first-class defense, of course, but that is not a first-class defense, right? At most, it would cost me a dime if bought singly at Tru Value Hardware.

So, if you were to do this at one of your shelters, the auditors would really be descending upon you, would they not? So, we have to compete within the budget process and I think that our record of efficiency and our record of using those dollars very well certainly is better, much better than a $9,606 Allen Wrench.

So, never be bashful, as I know you are not, in asking for those dollars and spend those dollars very efficiently. Children should be a very, very high priority.

Sally Maxton.

Ms. MAXTON. Midge Marangi is next.

Mr. KILDEE. OK.

STATEMENT OF MIDGE MARANGI, NEW HORIZONS SHELTER

Ms. MARANGI. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I am here today to talk about the plight of runaway shelters over the last 14 months and being involved in shelter care of adolescents.

I have had my eyes opened and have a real awakening to the plight of adolescents in our community, and I am sure this happens nationwide, although I can only speak for the one community that I have had at this point, well, two, really, because I have adolescents in my home and I work in another community.

As an administrator in a runaway shelter, my dilemma was daily, minute to minute, about whether I served as a person to support adolescents within that facility or I moved to administrative duties in collecting statistics, turning out reports, reading research. I did not even look to that. That was on the bottom of my file.

I had no time to do that and I as an administrator at that point to the dismay of people above me turned to working with adolescents, and I would make that the decision today. I think as an administrator, I saw more youth coming to our shelter in Medina, OH, that were very deeply in pain, that were very fearful inside, but outside wore such a tough exterior that at times you thought no one could get through that.

But through continual validations of their being, of their person, and continually building of their trust, I began over the last 14

months to see adolescents who could turn to someone and say, you are listening, there is someone out there, I can begin to trust.

I have had adolescents turn to me as they were walking up and down the street in front of the shelter I work for saying, I am going to run away and I said at that point, you run and I go with you, you need to start to trust. Why should I trust? Not one adult in my life experience has ever been trustworthy.

Those are the kind of things we are dealing with as shelter people, as shelter workers, on a daily basis. It is very difficult to look outside and not feel that those crises day to day and expand our horizons in looking for funding and beginning to look for expansion of funds.

Staffing at the shelter is sometimes one staff person to ten adolescents in pain. That is an unbelievable task for any one person to take on. During that time, not only are you dealing with ten adolescents but you are dealing with a crisis phone line within that community. You are dealing with families coming in talking about their crisis, even though their adolescent might not stay at your shelter for any extended period of time.

You are dealing with what are we going to have for dinner. You are dealing with toilets overflowing. Lights going off. The circuit breakers going off, and at times, you just stand there and put your hands to your head and say, where do I begin.

There have been times I have gone into the shelter, the staff person, and I was not sure whether we did not need a machine that turned out numbers because I was not sure whether at any other time we could deal with in any order the crises that we were dealing with.

I have kind of a theory about shelter workers. They are people who enjoy crisis and come to know crisis and sometimes deal with crisis in their personal life, because they do not know any other way. There was no time during the fourteen months that I worked at the shelter that I could exist. I existed on crisis every day, and therefore burn out is a part of your life, too. You realize that you are not sure how long you can continue at this level. Not even talking about the money or the funding.

There are times when single staff, there is no one there to support you as a staff person. There is no one to turn around and say, is there anybody else around who cares. You are there alone and you deal with all those things alone.

I feel that shelter workers across the Nation are one heck of a strong population because if you can deal with this on any extended period of time, you deserve an award of some kind because you are there emotionally and physically for those adolescents.

Funding problems are always there. Low salaries, raises that go by, the rest of the community is getting three to five percent raises, you are working at the level that you are being asked to work at with no raise.

When I came into the shelter, there had not been any raise at that shelter for 3 years. The turnover is unbelievable. You cannot ask someone to deal at that level of crisis with low staffing for any extended period of time, and as Jane talked about, we have new staff coming in all the time. In order to provide a quality program, you must provide training for that staff. Training is an impossible

task, especially when you are living with funding that is definite, that is there, that is not flexible. You cannot ask a staff member to stay an extra week to train that person that is taking their position.

You ask that person to step in as a new staff person and to take over at a level they have no idea would happen. I put a new staff member on and that staff member was saying at that point, I am not sure I can do this because they were not, they were not trained to the level they needed to be trained before they were thrown out into the battlefield, and it is sometimes exactly what it is, a battlefield.

Because of the populations we are asked to deal with on a continual basis, those populations contain a great deal of fear and anxiety.

I feel that we must have crisis shelters nationwide. We must have crisis places for families to go. That is the time to get some inroads to those families, to make some changes. That is the time we all, even personally, make the changes in our lives that are needed in our lives.

This is the place where people feel supportive within our community and within our society. They feel that they have someone out there who understands and who has the same problems that they do.

With that crisis, yes, you can begin to deal with the crisis and settle the crisis for that moment, but if you disappear as a person and the family says it is another place where I have reached out to that community and have begun to trust they are not there anymore. So, after-care programs in our shelters are a must.

We must be able to transition our families into other community resources and places where they will find care and support. There is nothing worse than at a time of crisis to turn around and find no one standing there and not know where to turn. Sometimes—as a shelter director, there were times when I certainly felt that, and I guess, in retrospect, in looking back, this was a learning experience because I have begun to understand what my families who came into that shelter were dealing with and how they needed someone to stand behind them and say, you are alive, you are well, you are OK, I am here to support you.

That does not mean I am going to do for you, but that means I will support you. Our shelters, as you talked about, do exist on shoe string budgets. We must reach out and ask those people that can provide us with help, for money. We must also turn to our communities and ask our communities for support so that they realize the type of services we provide and if we were not there, what would happen to our individual communities.

I asked for in the shelter I worked for and they did not receive any funds from the Federal Government. We received funds from the State and from the department of education in the State.

If we were to ask for funds and the shelter I worked for sat at the table with all the network of runaway shelter directors within Ohio, it is a very strong network and you begin to learn as a shelter who does not receive any Federal funds that if you ask for funds from the Federal Government, you will be asking every one

of your friends in support systems to take from their budget and hand to you.

Now, I believe there was a time that they would gladly do that, but there must be strong programs within communities before that is looked at because you are asking shelters that provide help for beginning shelters to take from their funds and therefore not be able to possibly afford to make a phone call to Midge Marangi in an outside community and say, how are you doing, I am there for you.

So, startup grants must have community support, I feel, in the beginning of community funding in order for them to exist on a long-term basis and not receive your funding for 1 year and turn around and say we cannot do this. Over the last 14 months, I have learned that it is not an easy task to run a runaway shelter, not only financially but emotionally.

I, at this point, am not working in that field. I will not stop, though, because I feel there is a real need in our individual communities and there is a great deal of pain out there.

I thank you for your time and I ask your cooperation in providing the funds that are needed for the services to our individual communities and our society.

Mr. KILDEE. Just a point on your last statement, too, about not asking for Federal funds. I have that same situation in my home town of Flint, MI, at Project Reach, Bob Tambelini has been the director there.

He has not asked for money because he knows if he does ask for money, that another project is going to lose money. As a matter of fact, I talked to the director of the program at Grand Rapids, MI, outside my district, and they are so happy he has not asked because then their grant would be diluted. That is a terrible pressure put on somebody because he could do more yet he realizes that if he were to take money, then another project would do less.

So, there is a certain generous spirit. It is hard to push that generosity upon people when they have to be generous with such a small amount of money. I appreciate that.

OK. Sally, you have been very patient.

STATEMENT OF SALLY MAXTON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, OHIO YOUTH SERVICES NETWORK, COLUMBUS, OH

Ms. MAXTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, introduce the shelter directors that are here and just ask them to stand up.

Mr. KILDEE. Please. Please do that.

Ms. MAXTON. Ohio Runaway Shelter and the young people who are here representing the shelters. Thank you.

Mr. KILDEE. Let me say this very honestly, very sincerely, I met a few of them outside, and I can tell that they are very good dedicated people. I just met a few, and now I know why the shelters do work so well.

Ms. MAXTON. Yes. I think you can see, Mr. Chairman, our pride in our work and the reason for that pride, and it has to do with the resources of our staff. Never before have I met the kind of committed people that I have met in this work.

We are especially grateful that you would take the time to come and hear our concerns at the local level because sometimes by the time they get translated nationally, they have been watered down a little, and I do not think there is any way that we could have expressed it more pointedly than with the young people who are speaking to you today.

I had, too, had bought some military hardware that I purchased for 39 cents and I figured with this, Mr. Chairman, we could probably double the cost of the Runaway Youth Act at least with the switch from the 1-B-1 bomber, we might be able to do it.

But when it comes to our children, it seems to be a different story with this administration. There is a story about the commuter trains in England that I was reading last year. The president in charge of the train company was given an award because he was always on time. When he was in the middle of the award ceremony, they asked him how was he able to accomplish this feat, and he said, "Well, we only pick up every other passenger."

In some ways, that is what we are doing in our runaway centers. We are not able to do a great deal of recruitment, a great deal of outreach because we are only handling those passengers who are in the most crisis, who are then by word of mouth hearing about our services.

I think as you heard, the people of Michigan advertised on two buses for a short period of time and had so many clients, they had to send them away. The figure of 65,000 runaways a year in Ohio is based on 1979 data. We figure that it is probably doubled or tripled since then, based on the local data that we have, and we know we are not reaching those kids and we know that the people today have told you the kind of crisis that we are dealing with, and we are talking about a lot of kids in this country who are experiencing crisis.

We wanted to give you just a few numbers about Ohio and I am skipping over pieces that I have been mentioned already this morning. But in Ohio over the last 12 months, we have served in runaway shelters on a residential basis 4,066 youth, and 3,044 in a nonresidential basis.

Our shelters are open 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, rain or shine, and yet they employ an average of 16 staff, half of those which are part time, so you are talking about 12 staff people who work three shifts 24 hours a day, which averages four people a shift, and you have a director and a secretary who have to do all the paper work for the grants.

So, when you are talking about people being tasked, there is almost no way to describe the kind of stress and strain or the lifetime of crisis, and it just blows my mind that some people have stayed in this work ten, fourteen, sixteen years, and it certainly is not the pay. The only thing that keeps them there is a dedication to service.

The one chance that we get to address the funding, which makes our life so integral and it is so difficult with the staff at the hearing today and when the reauthorization comes up, and I am hoping that I can make some of those points which many have been made very beautifully to you today.

As I said, one of the issues, a major issue for us is funding. We have worked hard to develop a multifunding base. Most of our funds come from four to six different funding sources, including local and national funding sources. We supplement our work with volunteers.

In 1984, each shelter averaged 56 volunteers and 6,100 volunteer hours a year, and we had eight VISTA workers who were placed around the State, although we have had a great deal of problems in the last year accessing VISTA workers.

Even with these efforts, as you have also heard today, a lot of the staff are drastically underpaid and working a great many hours. I got to ready to reference a story Tom told you about the hamburger chain, which is a true story in Ohio, working at fast foods and he will make more in an entry level position than you will working in our house. So, we had kids on work-release who were making more than the staff, and I appreciate your bringing up that point because it is an incredible issue.

The major resources of our shelters are certainly not their facilities. We were very grateful for Representative Campbell's efforts in providing operational money this year and a couple of years ago in providing some capital improvement money. Most of the shelters are still in fairly shabby shape when you look at—they have made some improvements, but we still have plaster falling off the walls and bad plumbing. Furniture is terrible.

Our resource, our chief resource is not our food. A lot of us use general relief cooks and USDA food and do the best with what we have. In addition, our recreation, you will not see facilities when you go there with swimming pools and gymnasiums and so forth. Only our chief resource is the staff that we have, but it is a golden resource and it is a golden staff and that is why our kids stay. Because when they come to our shelters, they know that there is someone there who cares and who has the skills to help them through their crisis, to help them in reconciling them with their families, and they are able to do that beautifully, and I think one of the reasons, when Midge talked about people in crisis and the time of life when you have spent a lot of time in crisis, the ability to relate to kids, this work seems to attract those people who really know how to relate to kids and who understand crisis and are able to bring kids and families through that.

The other comment that I wanted to make in terms of the runaway situation as the runaway rate for our state institutions, the one at Columbus at least, has been much higher than that for runaway shelters, even though they are staff secure and have wire around the fences, and that again is the ability of the staff.

There is an atmosphere in the shelters which kids comment on all the time, that they feel at home, and that is something that you do not get many places. You will see it in a number and a variety of programs, but the fact that kids on voluntary leave, many times, choose to stay, makes a difference as well with the shelter.

I just know that we have a tremendous responsibility to protect this resource, the resource of our staff from the kind of stress and burnout they are going through and when the Government has the military screwing us, it is enough to make you want to give up and you cannot give up.

There is a story that was in the paper last week about a man who was dying and he had 8 hours to live and the doctor told him by 7 in the morning, he would be dead. There was no possibility of him living beyond 7 in the morning. So, he went home to his wife and he said, "Maude, I have been told that by 7 in the morning, I will be dead, and why don't we spend our last 7 or 8 hours making mad passionate love all night?" And she turned and replied, "That's easy for you to say, you don't have to get up in the morning."

Mr. KILDEE. I never told one that bad.

Ms. MAXTON. That is the sort of mentality and callousness that we sometimes get from our funding sources and people who give us latitude at the federal level and at the state levels sometimes and just develop a multi-funding base. Write to foundations. Write an innovative grant. Network with your state legislature.

Our shelters have done all of this they could and they have done it successfully and they are still stretched for resources. I mean, we have touched all of those bases, and we are still struggling to try to meet the needs of Ohio kids in crisis, and I know that that is the case around the rest of the country with many of our shelters.

We were thrilled when Representative Campbell was able to access a $100,000 in the state budget. That was seen as a major miracle because we had millions cut off of the DYS budget, which was dramatically needed in the resource budget and from a number of other sources as well.

As you have heard this morning, last year, a significant portion of the Runaway Youth Act went to discretionary grants, for research and demonstration grants, and there are several reasons that we would like to express, some of which have been expressed this morning, in terms of why those grants need to be cut back and why we need to earmark ninety to ninety-five percent, and I will explain the variety in that figure in a second, for our basic center grants.

The grants have to be splashy and obvious. So, you come up with something that can be a dream, it can be something that sounds flashy and innovative, in order to access these discretionary monies.

The topics of these grants are sometimes unrelated. There was one on serving kids of women in prison, which is a good issue, but it is not a runaway issue. There have been some grants that had dealt with kids in work force, but we had 20 million unspent by a private industry council in Ohio last year. So, we do not need youth employment programs to be used out of the Runaway Youth Act. We have to use it for our basic services.

And then we have had some national training things that have been done where our State can afford to send one or two people to a national training event, splashy events, but they are not getting to my staff. Again, it is not a service that is needed out of the discretionary grants when you look at the crisis that our shelters have.

All right. So, if you look at the MASH unit in a triage. We are talking about a critically ill patient here whereas in many cases, the discretionary grants are talking about a facelift or a tummy tuck.

Innovations can still be supported but with one or two pilots in a variety of categories. We do not need to spend the kind of money we are spending on R&D. It takes 2 or 3 weeks. We got one once, we wished we had not, we never have written one since because the Feds had us turning flips to document what you are doing, to go through the research, the paper work is enormous, and by the time you do it, it takes away from the direct service that you should have been doing in the first place and needed to be doing.

The energy that it takes both to write and implement a research and demonstration grant can be quite frustrating. Both Bob Mecum, who runs Lighthouse and New Life Youth Services in Cincinnati, and Doug McCoard of Huckleberry House, have received R&D grants. They got great reviews from their communities. They were good subjects. We needed them. The Feds loved them.

A couple of years after the grants were done, they came to a screeching halt. They were innovative, but there was no funding available down the road. Communities had to deal with again their own triage system. They had to deal with basic needs, not the splashy kinds of innovative programs. so, it is a cycle of life and death with the discretionary programs, and it is a funding hoop we all jump through.

People say do something innovative and we will give you a 2-year grant and it has become the rage. What we need is basic continuation funding for center grants. It does not require new grantsmanship. But that can take time and the kind of care of staff issues and resources issues to serve kids in crisis that Jane and others have been talking about here this morning, and that is—therefore, we recommend the 90 to 95 percent be earmarked for basic center grants.

You have already heard the issue in terms of new starts and how the shelters have been taken away before they start. Another side issue is that why people are so anxious for new starts. Sometimes we do not even look at quality issues with the program. They almost funded last year a warehouse in the Bronx and then they found out it was what was called a furniture center and not a runaway center, but fortunately it was caught before it went too far.

But we need to look at quality assurance issues in terms of funding the current programs.

We would recommend that an additional 5 percent of the Runaway Youth Act funds could be used for new starts, so that we have 90 percent for basic grants and 5 percent for new starts, and give them 2 or 3 years to prove themselves with an annual evaluation.

So, you separate the pot of money. That way, you are not asking your distant shelters to compete with your new shelters, but you can do some growth in terms of the service areas. But those two need to be separated out.

We are concerned about the plight of the homeless. We are aware of the Leland bill. We had thought on the morning that bill came through that that was going to be a good shot for us in terms of doing some of the work with runaway kids and some of the homeless kids on independent living. However, it is only for IV-E eligible kids. So, here in Ohio, it has translated to child placing

agencies and we have found that, for the most part, our runaway shelters are not eligible for the IV-E independent living funds.

We are concerned with the points that Jane raised about the homeless, yet if we do a program, it would have to be a separate initiative. The issues with runaway kids and homeless kids and particularly transitional living are very different. You are talking about the difference in a shelter, a short-term crisis center intervention, and with homeless youth and the need for transitional living program at a long-range situation.

The other thing that is important and that I think the Leland piece recognizes is that the eighteen age limit for homeless youth and throwaway kids. Nothing happens magically on your 18th birthday except you get denied services. You do not magically heal yourself when you turn 18 and yet a lot of funding sources kind of thing that is the magical number, even require you to stop services when a kid becomes 18.

We have heard from our local mental health agencies that a lot of homeless kids or kids with severe emotional problems, some of whom we have seen in our shelters, are ending up being dumped on the mental health system which does not want them either and then they end up as older adults among the ranks of the homeless. So, something does need to be dealt with in terms of that population, but we again need more money, a separate budget category that does not compete with existing shelters to take care of this population with a different program model for kids who are in tremendous need.

It is not as much an issue in Ohio as it is in some other states, but we do see kids who are living out of cars. We see kids who have been thrown away because parents do not want them back, and we see some kids who are on the street, not just the degree that New York and San Francisco may have. Probably three of our shelters have been involved in homeless issues and they work with their local coalitions, but there is a need for youth services there.

Just a couple of last points. I wanted to mention the importance, and I think Judge Kannel mentioned this a little bit, of runaway shelters and the compliance issue in terms of the Office of Juvenile Justice that was mentioned.

We are constantly talking about the deinstitutionalization of status offenders and becoming compliant. I think it has been a well kept secret in some ways just how vital runaway shelters are to that effort. Not only are they dealing with runaway kids and an alternative to incarceration, they are—a lot of kids also have had issues with truancy and incorrigibility, and you are looking at a program that works to reconcile families and get beyond those differences, so instead of the detention model being used for those issues, you have a family crisis center which is working positively and in those communities that have shelters, we do tend to see very high compliance rates.

I wanted to mention a couple of pieces on the Juvenile Justice Act, which I believe Representative Campbell has mentioned. We would like to see the same thing happen, Mr. Chairman, with the Juvenile Justice funding that we are recommending for the Runaway Youth Act, and that is an earmarking of funds or state block grants.

We have seen some very bizarre discretionary grants over the years. The pornography study. We have seen some very strange things coming down the pike. Our State has made tremendous progress on jail removal. We have gone from 6,000 to 300 in two counties and we expect to have the committees pass a bill to make jail removal mandatory in the state so that no kid can be held in a jail, and that has been targeted.

We have made some progress on the status offender issues, but there has not been much work, as was mentioned, on the violation of valid court order and we would support, as well as Representative Campbell, the idea of looking at those who violate the valid court order and limiting the time to, say, 15 days because you are looking at kids who have the second truancy and so forth and that is an important part of the Act, and we are hoping that something will be done in Ohio along those lines.

We have also made some progress in terms of—with OJJDP funds in Ohio for serious violent offenders and adolescent sex offenders, and we will again look at the broad spectrum of kids who have been sexually abused and the numbers. We have 7,000 cases of sexual abuse of kids last year in Ohio.

The interesting figures in one of the models that has come to our attention was identified by Safe Space Station. They started seeing runaway kids, about two dozen a year, who had been molested as children and were now in turn molesting children. There is a cycle there. There is a new technology or state of the art in terms of treating adolescents at the centers.

If you can get them as adolescents and provide effective treatment, you can work to eliminate a generation of adult perpetrators, both incest perpetrators and rapists. It is a very effective model. We have seen a scattering of programs developed around the state, and it is certainly a more positive approach to child abuse than waiting to remove kids from the home when they are victimized and picking up the pieces afterward.

If we can deal with kids and their sexual issues when they first start acting out, then sometimes those first acts are simply facades or voyeurism and so forth, but if we have the treatment models there, then they never reach adulthood with serious offending and that kind of behavior. We can do a lot towards stopping sexual abuse.

So, we would like to recommend that there be an initiative, if there is some discretionary money available, to look at that issue of treating adolescent sex offenders and violent offenders.

On the missing kids effort, we have one recommendation for an amendment and that is that you look at the difference between a runaway child and a missing child, and I know you are aware of the history of the different numbers, but the key word on all of that is concealment.

A missing child is a child who has been concealed by someone. A runaway child is one who is voluntarily missing. We also question the function of the Attorney General's Advisory Board, which has recommended locking up runaways. As I think you heard this morning, there is absolutely nothing to be benefitted from that when we have a crisis intervention model that is so effective.

I wanted to end with just a couple of stories. The first relates again to these screws and the funding. Last year, my nine-year old daughter was asked to write a theme, what would I buy if I could buy anything I wanted, and she said I would buy Eastland Mall because it has a lot of stuff I want.

Sometimes it sounds like that is what we are asking for when we talk about kids programs, but if you look at the picture, our kids deserve Eastland Mall, but if you look at the picture of what goes to the military, what goes to the other areas of this government, what we are spending and what this committee has given to spend for kids, it is minuscule.

The funding for the Runaway Youth Act, given the kind of work that is done, the bureaucracy in it is fairly limited compared to many other government programs. It is abominably low.

If there is any way the committee could look at the funding base, it would help us resolve a lot of these problems and remove a lot of the stress and strain from the shelter staff as well as from the kids in terms of them having their issues met on an around the clock basis.

The final story that I would like to tell, I am going to skip the one in here, just in the interest of time, this had to do with the overall purpose of the Act, kids in crisis and kids in general.

It is a story of a family, they are reading at the table, and the grandmother, whose fingers are getting withered with age and she drops her spoon. So, the father says to her, "Woman, you no longer can eat at the table. You're too messy. At least we will take away your silverware and from now on you will drink from the bowl." And the next night, she drops the bowl, so they take away her bowl and they build a trough by the fireside and say, "Old Woman, from now on, we don't want to look at you. You're disgusting to look at. You will eat by this trough by the fireside."

About a week later, the mother and father come upon their little boy and he is hammering with nails and screws and wood, pieces of board, at the fireside and ask him, "What are you doing?" He says, "Well, I'm making a trough for mommy and daddy to eat out of when they get old."

The scariest thing about all of this, I think, is this is the generation, these kids in crisis, this is the generation that will make the decisions about us when we are old. They will be tomorrow's leaders, and yet we are ignoring their needs right now. We see a lot of media stuff about kids in crisis.

We know the issues are there. Teen pregnancy, suicidal issues, depression, and we know they are escalating, and yet we are dramatically underfunding those programs that are best at meeting the needs of those kids.

We know that we in many ways are preaching to the choir. You are the ones who have saved us over the years and for that we thank you, and also for coming to Ohio for this hearing.

We are strongly supportive of, as you can tell, the Runaway Youth Act and the Juvenile Justice Act.

So, thank you for being here and thank you for your support in the Runaway Youth Act.

[The prepared statement of Sally Maxton follows:]

TESTIMONY OF SALLY MAXTON

HUMAN RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE
THE HONORABLE DALE KILDEE, CHAIRMAN
AKRON, OHIO
MARCH 5, 1988

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. Good morning. I am Sally Maxton, Director of the Ohio Youth Services Network. Mr. Chairman and Congressman Sawyer, we want to thank you for all of your work on reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice Act and the Runaway Youth Act and for holding this hearing in Akron, Ohio to allow us the opportunity to share our concerns with you regarding reauthorization.

We understand that the Human Resources subcommittee has some very difficult decisions to make regarding funding priorities but we hope to leave you with no doubts as to the value and cost effectiveness of runaway youth centers in Ohio, and across the country.

Mr. Chairman, for the cost the military pays for this bag of screws which we purchased at a local hardware store for 39 cents we could fund several runaway centers in Ohio. For the cost of one B-1 bomber, or maybe even just the screws in one B-1 bomber, we could double the funding for the Runaway Youth Act.

There was a story last year about the commuter trains in England. The president in charge of the train companies was presented with an award because in his charge as president, for an entire year all of the trains had been on time.

When asked how he had accomplished this incredible feat he responded, "ladies and gentlemen, it's very simple. We were able to keep to our schedule perfectly because we only picked up every other passenger."

This is what we seem to be doing with our runaway centers in Ohio, only we're averaging more like one in ten. The shelters operate on a concept of unconditional care and are working to ensure that kids who self-refer to runaway shelters are not turned away. Where the lack of resources takes its toll is in terms of outreach services as I believe you heard from Michigan runaway centers last month. When they utilized just two city buses to advertise their services, they were overwhelmed with the large number of clients.

We know that we are not reaching all of the runaway youth in Ohio and that we, like Michigan, are not in a position to do extensive outreach services to runaway youth in crisis. There are many unserved and underserved areas both locally and across the state.

Accurate estimates of the numbers of runaway youth are difficult if not impossible to obtain, as many runaways do not come into contact with legal or other youth-service systems. A few studies have been undertaken in the past that have sought to arrive at more accurate figures of the prevalence of running away. Based upon a study conducted in the mid-1970's by Berkeley Planning Associates, it was estimated that 55,000 Ohio youth run away from home each year. The results of the

National Youth Survey project on the prevalence of delinquent behavior, conducted annually by the Behavioral Research Institute, indicated that, of a representative national sample of youth, an average of 5.2% indicated that they had run away during the previous year. This average is based upon annual responses for the period of time from 1976-1980, the last year that this particular question was asked.

The following data is reflective of the services that the eleven runaway shelters currently operating in Ohio are providing each year. It was derived by doing a projection for a year period of time based upon actual service data from the last six months of 1987:

- 4,066 youth will be provided with residential services
- 3,044 youth will be served on a non-residential basis
- 1,694 youth will be served on a one-time contact only basis
- 1,890 youth will be provided with aftercare services
- 2,582 families will receive counseling

Runaway shelters offer in-person and telephone crisis intervention services 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, yet based upon the Ohio shelters that responded to a 1985 survey conducted by the Ohio Youth Services Network, the average shelter employed only 16 staff persons--half of whom were part-time.

One of the major issues for us, therefore, is lack of funding. It is our hope that somehow in the appropriations process a figure for the Runaway Youth Act of $50 million, or a pound of Pentagon screws, can become a reality.

You have heard in national testimony and in this morning's testimony about the value of the work that the shelters do and about their resource issues. You have also heard how Safe Landing has worked effectively to generate community resources to support two local shelters. In 1984, the average Ohio shelter received funding from two federal sources and four other sources, such as city/county, United Way, foundations, corporations, and individuals. That same year each shelter averaged 56 volunteers and 6,100 volunteer hours per year of volunteer time, supplemented by 16,640 hours of service by 8 VISTA volunteers working across the state.

Even with these monumental efforts to develop a multi-funding base they are struggling to adequately support the operations of 24-hour crisis centers. Many of them are dramatically understaffed and staff are dramatically underpaid.

You may have heard recently that Doug McCoard, Director of Huckleberry House, completed a comparable salary survey and found that the entry level salary at a local hamburger chain was $1.00 more per hour than the entry level salary for house managers at the runaway center.

The major resources for runaway and family crisis centers is not their facilities. Although the state of Ohio provided us with $250,000 a year ago for capital improvements which allowed Safe Landing to purchase a new facility and allowed other centers to make other drastically needed improvements, many of the shelters still have major plumbing, heating and weatherization problems, walls in need of plastering, drafty

windows, and furniture in need of repair, but the shelters are functional, and comfortable, and youth comment frequently that they feel at home there.

The major resource for a runaway center is not the food, although home cooked meals are provided, and some centers rely on resources from USDA government surplus programs and sometimes utilize cooks from the general relief program.

The shelters' major resource is not recreation -- you will not see gymnasiums or swimming pools there, though you will see arts and crafts, and guided meditations, and a great deal of individual and family counseling going on.

The major resource for a runaway center, and for the runaway youth coming there in crisis, is the staff of the center, and that is why they have been so successful in engaging youth and why youth come there voluntarily and stay. Doug McCourd commented to me recently that the rate of runaways from state DYS facilities, secure facilities covered with rolls of razor sharp concertina wire, is far higher than the rate at Huckleberry House which is not staff secure, and provides open doors.

Kids don't run away from our runaway centers because they are getting what they need in terms of support and help in resolving their crisis whether it be drug and alcohol issues, school problems, physical or sexual abuse (which is estimated to be the case with up to 60% of our youth), suicidal problems, depression, educational issues, family conflicts, and other problems.

And yet this golden resource, our staff, is tremendously underpaid and overworked. It never ceases to amaze me how staff can continuously work long hours a week for low salaries with very little chance of promotion or salary increase. I have seen some staff continue to work for fourteen or fifteen years because of their deep devotion to kids and families in crisis and I marvel at their tenacity and strength.

I have also seen all but one shelter director in Ohio finally decide to leave their jobs, not because they didn't love their work but because they couldn't support their families and something in the youth work field was offered to them paying twice as much. I have witnessed the burnout and stress of runaway shelter directors and line staff who have left this work over the last nine years, and those who continue to toil in these rugged vineyards, with their satisfaction in helping youth in crisis and reconciling families providing them with motivation and strength against incredible obstacles.

We have a tremendous responsibility to protect this resource which meets a need that many traditional agencies don't know how to meet.

There was a story in the paper last week about a man who was dying. His doctor told him to go home to die, that there was no possibility of his surviving beyond seven o'clock the next morning.

He accepted his fate and said to his wife, "Maude, we have eight hours left together. Let's spend our time making mad, passionate love

together and our last memories will be beautiful ones."

She turned to him and replied, "That's easy for you to say, Harold. You don't have to get up in the morning."

Sometimes I feel that that same callous attitude is the one we get from our funding sources who have no concept of what an incredible strain and stress is involved in working in a 24-hour crisis center and so simply give us platitudes, "Just develop a multi-funding base." "Write to foundations." "Write an innovative discretionary grant." "Network with your state legislature."

We have done all of these things and more. As Representative Jane Campbell has told you this state, through her efforts, recently allocated $100,000 per year for operational funds for runaway centers. This was seen as a major miracle in the state budget and was one of the few new initiatives funded at a time when human services were cut by millions of dollars.

It is simply not as easy as it sounds to our funding sources to develop an adequate funding base for shelters, and in rural areas and small towns it is particularly difficult.

Last year, 83.5% of the Runaway Youth Act appropriation was spent on basic center grants. About one and a half million dollars was spent on high impact grants and cross-program model demonstrations. Some of these models have been interesting and some have even been related to runaway youth, but we have a problem with this piece for several reasons.

First, we haven't met the basic needs of our existing runaway centers. We are not providing adequate funding for staffing 24 hour, round the-clock crisis counseling. These grants are splashy and innovative but often not essential. It is like the fringe in a MASH unit. We need to take care of our basic center grants which are in critical condition rather than funding a large number of innovations, which represent more the plastic surgery, face lift part of the fringe, optional -- not essential.

Innovations can still be supported but with one or two pilots in essential areas rather than six or seven in a variety of categories, some of which have not been remotely related to runaways.

The second issue with discretionary grants is the incredible amount of time it takes to write a grant (our shelters do not have development staff) and then to implement it. Our agency did a research and demonstration grant with HHS a few years back and the R & D took so much time away from our basic functions we opted not to do another one.

Thirdly, these grants are temporary. A shelter invests a great deal of time and energy in writing and implementing an R & D grant only to have the grant come to a screeching halt after two or three years. It is far more difficult than our funding sources realize to get local or state resources to pick up on these innovations.

Bob Mecum, Director of New Life Youth Services which operates Lighthouse

Runaway Center in Cincinnati, and Doug McCoard of Huckleberry House, have both received several R & D grants and received rave reviews from YDB and local media for their work. Both of them support earmarking 90 to 95% of RYA funds for basic center grants. Too often they have seen their wonderful work on the Freedom Factory, Teen Suicide, Child Abuse, etc. come to naught when the discretionary grant funding cycle ends. They then have to either close the programs and lay off the staff who have been trained to provide this innovative model or create something new, innovative and splashy only to have to witness its death two years later.

None of this makes sense when the basic, most critical crisis intervention and shelter services are underfunded and shelters across the country are dying on the vine.

RECOMMENDATION 1:

Therefore, we recommend that 90-95% of Runaway Youth Act funds be earmarked for basic center grants, the most critical service to runaway and homeless youth.

NEW STARTS

Whether we recommend 90 or 95% depends on the Committee's response to our recommendation on new starts, that is newly created runaway centers funded under the Runaway Youth Act. there is a need for more runaway centers in Ohio and in other parts of the country. However, the mechanism for funding new starts provides a curious catch.

Two years ago a new center was funded in Clermont County for $70,000 This was done by taking funds from each existing center. Although shelters have been supportive of new centers and staff once they are on board, it puts both new starts and existing shelters in an unfair predicament when one is funded at the expense of the other.

A side issue relates to the quality of new starts. We understand that in their interest to start new programs, YDB almost funded a furniture warehouse in the Bronx. Fortunately, someone who knew the name called to inform them that this was a center for furniture, not runaway youth.

YDB needs to review its policy on funding new starts. In some ways it's like a family which cannot afford to feed its four children deciding to adopt three more. It's noble but maybe not so wise.

RECOMMENDATION 2:

Therefore, we recommend that 5% of the Runaway Youth Act appropriation be earmarked for new starts, and that clear criteria be established for these grants to ensure that they are providing alternative, non-secure services to runaways. These grants should be funded for three years out of the new start initiative, with continued funding dependent on an annual evaluation. If this recommendation is not accepted, we would then recommend that 95% of RYA funding be allocated to direct center grants.

RECOMMENDATION 3:

We recommend that no more than 5% of the current RYA appropriation be spent for services other than direct services by runaway centers and that priorities be established for use of discretionary funds so that they are of direct benefit to runaway youth.

This would allow for earmarking funds for the national toll-free communications system, which benefits runaway youth across the nation and for coordinated networking grants which should be provided for regional and state networks but it should be capped at the existing funding amount.

HOMELESS YOUTH

The plight of homeless youth in this country as well as homeless families reflects a most disturbing trend. I don't believe that we are seeing the kinds of numbers of homeless youth that are being seen in cities like New York and Los Angeles. Several of our shelters are involved with local homeless coalitions to provide coordinated services to youth and families.

Many of our shelters have expressed concern that youth who turn 18 are not magically healed but are often denied service because of their age and state and federal regulations which prohibit services to youth 18 years and older. We have also heard from local mental health systems that they are seeing a number of our transient children as homeless adults with severe emotional problems.

We had hoped that the Moynihan bill which provided $40 million for independent living would help us to resolve this issue, but these funds are for IV-E children who have come through the child welfare system and in Ohio are used to fund child welfare placing agencies. This is not much help to the truly homeless.

We want to emphasize that the transitional living project should include a clear definition of homeless -- so that these programs are serving the truly homeless and "throwaway" kids.

It is also important that a clear distinction be made between transitional living programs for the homeless and runaway crisis centers. One is long term and the other short term crisis intervention. Both are needed. Language needs to be clear so that runaway centers do not become long term child placing agencies for the child welfare system.

The shelter function of providing crisis care and reconciling the majority of youth and families and therefore avoiding placement should not be lost, but there should be a clear, effective working program for homeless youth.

RECOMMENDATION 4:

Additional funds should be provided for transitional living projects for homeless youth ages 15-21 years for whom it is not possible to live in a safe environment with a relative and who has no other safe living arrangement.

RELATIONSHIP OF RYA TO OJJDP COMPLIANCE

Because the Runaway Youth Act is Title III of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, I want to stress how important it is to the Act. In communities where runaway shelters exist we often see the highest rates of compliancy with OJJDP mandates regarding deinstitutionalization of status offenders.

As you have heard from Judge Kennell this morning, courts in these communities, as well as police, utilize runaway centers as an alternative to detention. They have continued to use the shelters over the years because of their effectiveness in serving runaway youth. Many of the youth our shelters see also have problems with truancy and incorrigibility, other unruly offenses in Ohio. The crisis intervention service allows informal intervention on these issues and working productively with families and youth, thereby avoiding detention altogether.

In communities where shelters do not exist courts use a variety of dispositions including detention, diversion, and group home and foster home placement which often occurs for a much longer period of time than the short term crisis services provided in the shelter.

Of significant concern in some counties is the use of violation of a valid court order which often results in long term detention (up to 90 days) for a second status offense, e.g. second runaway, truancy, or incorrigibility charge. Since the Ashbrook amendment exempted VCO's from compliance monitoring, these youth are not even being tracked and some are staying far too long. I have spoken with a couple of judges and detention center staff, one of whom recommended a limit of five days in detention for violation of a valid court order, and another who recommended a 15 day limit. Parents also tend to abdicate responsibility for youth who have been placed in detention for a long term, making family reconciliation more difficult.

RECOMMENDATION 5:

Compliance tracking should be required of state planning agencies regarding numbers of youth in detention and length of stay for violation of a valid court order. Congress should mandate that no youth should be held for more than 5 days for violating a court order.

OJJDP FUNDING FOR STATE FORMULA GRANTS

Last year only $43 million of the $67 million allocated nationally to OJJDP was used for block grants to the states. This provided about $1.8 million for Ohio. Ohio uses this money very wisely, targeting funds to jail removal, DSO, alternatives to institutions and serious and sex offender treatment programs.

Use of federal discretionary grants has been more questionable.

RECOMMENDATION 6:

We recommend that 83% ($55,278,000 of this year's appropriation) of the

appropriation for OJJDP be earmarked for state block grants.

LOSS OF FUNDING

Although this is a reauthorization hearing, we wanted to stress as strongly as possible the need to restore funding to OJJDP, to the Justice Assistance Act and to the Anti-Drug Abuse Act (Subtitle K). Loss of these funds would be absolutely devastating to Ohio.

JAA (Justice Assistance Act) funds are used to fund a variety of law enforcement and victim assistance funds as well as treatment for serious offenders. Ohio receives about $2 million from JAA and its share of Drug Abuse funding recently plummeted from $7 million to $1.7 million, this after DYS and other state and local projects had developed comprehensive drug treatment programs. The loss of the drug money will bring these programs to a screeching halt.

JAIL REMOVAL

Ohio has gone from holding about 6,000 youth in adult jails to 300 youth (in two counties), and it looks promising for a bill recently introduced in the state legislature to mandate jail removal. This could not have been accomplished without the Act and spares many Ohio youth from an incredibly victimizing experience.

However, Mr. Chairman, we hope we won't be fiscally punished for our success when we achieve 100% compliance in the near future. (We are aware of the proposed earmarking of $3 million of OJJDP funds for jail removal, an endeavor we fully support).

RECOMMENDATION 7:

We recommend permissive language in the reauthorization bill to say that if a state has achieved compliancy with jail removal mandates it is authorized to reprogram its share of the $3 million earmarked for jail removal for other initiatives provided for in its directives, e.g. the deinstitutionalization of status offenders, treatment for violent offenders and sex offenders, etc.

TREATMENT FOR VIOLENT OFFENDERS AND ADOLESCENT SEX OFFENDERS

Although earmarking $60 million for state block grants would be the most effective way to allow Ohio to provide more adequate funding for these programs, we may want to recommend this area as a funding category for federal discretionary grants.

These offenders require the most concentrated funding to provide longer term, more intensive treatment with a rich staffing pattern and tie into community protection and victim awareness issues.

The average adolescent sex offender has 7 victims. The average adult offender (according to Becker and Abel's research) has 76 victims. Treatment of adolescents, therefore, prevents victimization in a big way. (The average age of an adolescent sex offender's victim is age four).

There is a lot of discussion in Ohio about dealing with victims in the court system (investigation, prosecution, and treatment) but this approach is an ambulance approach, after devastating damage has been done.

Fay Honey Knopp has said dealing with sexual victimization by creating more victim programs is like dealing with diarrhea by creating more outhouses -- a graphic but true commentary.

RECOMMENDATION 8:

We recommend a federal initiative in the area of serious/violent and sex offenders.

MISSING CHILDREN'S ACT

RECOMMENDATION 9:

We recommend that the definitions in this act be amended to provide clarity regarding the difference between a missing and a runaway child. The key word regarding a missing child is concealments and this should be inserted. We also believe that the Attorney General's Advisory Board has not provided any insight into the issue of either runaways or missing children and suggest that it be abolished.

SUMMARY

Last year, my nine year old was asked to write an essay on the subject "What I would buy if I could buy anything I wanted." Her friends wrote about bikes and big wheels, chinese jump ropes and computers. Asia wrote, "Eastland Mall because it has a lot of stuff I want." It appears she is her mother's child.

I understand the limits of the federal budget in these years of Gramm Rudman, federal deficits, and stock market quirks, however, in closing, I want to share a brief science lesson from OMNI and relate it to the Chairman's interest in screws, and a fairy tale from the Brothers Grimm.

"In the Amazon jungle there lives a large blue butterfly. The larvae of the butterfly grow and thrive on sweet sticky substance exuded by the larvae of ants. The neighboring ants are seen daily in large lines delivering their babies to be eaten by the butterfly larvae. Whatever is exuded by the butterfly young must be so much like a drug to the adult ants that they allow their babies to be eaten for it."

This piece makes about as much sense to me as what the administration seems to do in the federal budget. We pay a fortune for military screws, but when it comes to our young, our elderly, our poor, our vulnerable populations, we deliver all of them to the door of one small appropriation and watch them eat each other up, and the young are eaten first because they don't vote and they don't lobby.

I have seen kids who have come to our shelters with a host of problems to be reconciled with their parents with their self-esteem intact. I have seen two weeks of intense, compassionate intervention by shelter

staff resolve a crisis. 80% of our youth end up back at home with their families. This two weeks of work with aftercare often means that rather than languishing in the child welfare system or juvenile justice system for years and becoming "systems kids" these kids stay with their families. This results in happier lifetimes as well as cost savings.

The final story is about a family. They are eating dinner and the grandmother, weary with the years, drops her spoon.

The father yells, "Old woman, you are too messy. From now on you will drink your soup from the bowl. You don't deserve silverware."

The next night, the grandmother dropped the whole bowl. The mother screamed at her, "Old woman, you are nothing but a pig. you are disgusting to look at. From now on you can't eat at the table. you will eat from a trough by the fireside."

The next night their young son was playing by the fireside with a hammer, boards and nails (and screws which he purchased at the hardware store for 5 cents). His father asked him what he was doing.

He replied, "I'm making a trough for mommy and daddy to eat out of when they get old."

The scariest part about this country's neglect and abuse of its young is that these are the children who will make the decisions about us and for us when we are old. If we provide the right support and resources for them now when they are in crisis, and give them the values, self esteem, and skills they need now, we will have healthy kids making good decisions. If not, we will pay the cost personally and as a nation.

CONCLUSION

The Runaway Youth Act works. We are aware of your miraculous efforts over the past years on behalf of this Act and the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act.

For this and for your wonderful support of runaway and homeless youth and youth in crisis, we thank you. We truly don't know what we would have done without you. Most of us wouldn't be here. Thank you.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much.

You made some very good points. I have always said that you can judge the humanity and decency of a society, both geographically, looking around the world today at various countries, and historically by looking through history, you can judge the humanity and decency of a society by looking at how they treat their children and the very old people, those who are generally the more vulnerable people in society.

You know, most of us in this room will do well no matter what Government does. We will survive, probably do better than survive, but there are certain people who really need a very sensitive Government. The Government that sets priorities, that says, you know, you are important, and because you are important, those programs designed to serve you must have high priority within our budgetary process.

I have said many times, you know, that Government's prime role is to promote, protect, defend and enhance human dignity, and I try to examine every bill that comes before the Congress of the United States with that in mind. I ask whether a bill will promote, protect and defend and enhance human dignity or does it intend to denigrate human dignity. When I consider Juvenile Justice Programs, WIC Programs, Aid to the Contras, or MX missiles, I ask myself that question.

Now, the question is easier than the answer, but the question should be asked, I think. Will this promote human dignity. I clearly think that when you help a child in the right direction and help that child achieve some self-esteem, that child probably will be able to take care of his or her problems.

I tell this story all over, but I will tell it now that I am in Akron about my son, Paul. I have three teenage children, and my son, Paul is kind of the philosopher humorist in the family. One evening when he was about 9 years old, I was tucking him in bed and hearing his prayers, and after he finished his formal prayers, he said, "I love God, I love Mommy, I love Daddy, I love Laura, I love David, and I love me." That is very important. It is very important.

Sometimes you have 2 weeks with these kids and if you can play some role in helping that child salvage, establish, maintain some self-esteem, it is very crucial and very important. It should be a high priority in government.

You mentioned the $9,000 you are paying people, $10,000, counsellors are $11,000. I want to be careful because I love animals. I have two cats and a dog. But I wonder how much we pay people at animal shelters. I wonder how much we pay people at the zoo. It would be interesting to compare what zookeepers are paid with people who work at the Genesee County Animal Shelter. It would be interesting to compare. I am sure they earn it, but it would be interesting to see how when we come to children, we say, well, we will get somebody because they are dedicated, pay them $9,000.

We should get upset all right. Anger can be a virtue if it drives us to seek a remedy for injustice. It can be a virtue.

Apparently in Summit County, people testified earlier you have a pretty good relationship between the police and the courts.

I appreciate your testimony.

Mr. Lawson.

STATEMENT OF JOHN LAWSON, ADMINISTRATOR AND STAFF ATTORNEY, SAFE SPACE STATION, CLEVELAND, OH

Mr. LAWSON. I believe, in general, as also will be reflected in my statement, however, other than the issue of contempt of court for the second-time or third-time runner, the felony escape concept is being used very prevalently in Cuyahoga County, which is the child is before a jurist and sent to a shelter or a placement or home and said, now, you are not allowed to leave that place or you are breaking detention. The concept of charging that status offender with a felony escape is being used on a regular basis, which is a way to indirectly do what the Federal act and the State laws are saying you cannot do directly.

So, there are problems in that area. Certainly, that is one of the reasons why a lawyer is on the staff of the shelter. It is the Free Clinic and Safe Space Station's viewpoint that total treatment of that child is what we would seek and if legal services is part of what we will seek in the best interests of that child, then they deserve the right to have that and to work in conjunction with the counsellors at the runaway shelter.

So, that is why I am on the staff and, unfortunately, I probably hurt the curve. I have been on that staff for twelve years. So, in terms of the 18 months average, I apologize. I am probably affecting it in a way that probably makes us look a little bit better than we really should be in the interest of turnover.

Mr. KILDEE. Your testimony will be included in the record and for our court reporter, could you give your full name for the record.

Mr. LAWSON. Yes. It is John H. Lawson, attorney for Safe Space Station.

[The prepared statement of John H. Lawson follows:]

TESTIMONY OF JOHN H. LAWSON Re the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act

My name is John H. Lawson and for the last 11 years I have been an administrator and staff attorney for the Safe Space Station, the Free Medical Clinic of Greater Cleveland's federally-funded youth shelter.

Since its inception and opening in January, 1977, the Station has developed and evolved its philosophies and direct service offering to reflect its own goals as well as those of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act: the offerance of services to runaways and other youth in a manner outside the law enforcement and juvenile justice systems. This committment to be an alternative to the mainstream of services had been a primary tenet of the Free Clinic in the hope that individuals who might not otherwise seek help for medical, dental and mental health programs might come to the Clinic because it was a nontraditional and relaxed atmosphere.

Once the Station opened its doors, it became evident that about one-third to one-half of the youth seeking services could not avoid some involvement with the "juvenile justice system". Many youth came to the shelter and had warrants active, mostly for status offenses. Many already had active juvenile court cases. Many of them could not return home because of clearcut abuse and neglect circumstances, and needed the juvenile justice system to protect them from reunification. Due to these immediate and emergency needs that many youths at the shelter faced, the Station felt that the offering of legal services was necessary to provide "total treatment" to each youth requesting assistance. Although my job title was administrative coordinator in 1976, my success in passing the bar exam in Ohio that year made my coincidental availability at the Station a natural for me to be involved with the Station counselors in maximizing the chances that a

given child would receive appropriate assistance from the juvenile justice system if they had to be involved. This offering of direct legal services to clients at a runaway shelter is, to our knowledge, unique, and we think, worthy of consideration to this committee in terms of future expansion of direct services funding.

In the last eleven years, I have represented an average of over 20 youths per month who have also been using residential or out-client services. This statistic does not include the countless counseling sessions and advice by telephone for youth and adults, or to staff.

The youth may come to the Station with any number of pre-existing legal problems. The child may have been on the run, his parents having filed an unruly complaint, and a warrant is active. Once the child comes to the Station, the counselor assigned will refer the matter to my attention, upon request, to try to have the warrant withdrawn so that admission to the Juvenile Detention facility can be avoided. Presuming that that is successful, the child can remain a resident and the staff will engage family in counseling to problem-solve and attempt to reunify. If our intervention is successful and the status offense is previously unheard, we then strongly encourage that the parent withdraw the charge and to further pursue addressing whatever issues were begun at the Station once the youth has returned home, either through aftercare counseling with us or at some other appropriate agency.

The youth could have an unruly or deliquent charge which has already been heard and cannot be withdrawn. If the child requests legal representation, then it becomes my responsibility to advocate within the court system for the child to be minimally involved if the family problems can be resolved. If alternative living arrangements are needed, my representation of the youth through that process

maximizes the chances that the "appropriate alternative living arrangements" which were identified during the youth's residency are pursued. It has never been realistic to plan and effectuate alternative living for a child within the Station's two-week residential period, and the provision of legal representation brings with it a built-in assurance that addresses that alternative living situation issue as well as expanding the Station "aftercare".

Many youth come to the Station and have not been charged with a status or delinquent offense, but still need some change of living situation which might trigger a referral for legal services. The classic situations are children who are abused or neglected. When a child cannot return home, the local department of human services will be engaged to assist and investigate. Ordinarily, it is their function to "protect" these types of children, but as with all large systems, caseloads are too big, and such youths are often lost in the bureaucracy. If the department of human services decides to file in the court alleging abuse or neglect, I may again be asked to represent the child.

There are a variety of reasons why this representation is needed, not the least of which is the child's right to get adequate and appropriate social working from the department of human services. First, the possibility that a child might be called upon to testify against a parent is always looming. (But can usually be avoided with proper advocacy, at least at a custody hearing). Second, the same problems arise in terms of inappropriate alternative placement. Why should an abuse victim be placed in an institutional setting while the offender is allowed to remain in the community? Third, many abuse cases, particularly sex abuse, result in criminal cases. A rape victim (including incest) has the right to private counsel in Ohio for

preliminary evidenciary hearings. I may enter my name as counsel for the victim in such a situation and work with the prosecutor in that limited role, once again, providing continuity to the child while attempting to minimize the trauma and to keep the number of times he or she might have to testify to a minimum.

It should also be noted in cases where the department of human services is involved, and particularly when criminal charges against a parent may be forthcoming, that the federal requirement to have parental contact within 72 hours becomes a tricky and often dangerous proposition. Working as the child's attorney to ensure that DHS seeks and receives emergency custody is necessary to assure that the child is kept safe and the Station's requirements are met as well. Needless to say, cooperation with the police is imperative in situations when criminal implications are present.

This Committee is well aware of the emphasis that has been placed on the State of Ohio through the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to deinstitutionalize and divert the status offender. The Station is also committed to those standards, both through its operations under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and in general. Within that philosophical position, the Station through the offerance of legal services to runaway and homeless youth, has noticed some alarming trends in the juvenile justice system since the State of Ohio has begun to deinstitutionalize the status offender.

In 1981 Ohio enacted laws which forbid courts from committing nonfelon/delinquents to the Ohio Department of Youth Servuices (locked state correctional facilities). At the same time, Ohio enacted the "five day rule" which stated that an unruly could not be placed in detention home for more than 5 days. Since these reforms, a number of new legal fictions have cropped up to try to do indirectly what

that law in 1981 said could not be done: the institutionalizaiton of status and minor offenders.

Courts in the greater Cleveland area have begun filing felony-escape charges aginast youth who run away from court shelters, placements, and even home. This legal fiction turns the status offender into a "felon" for the mere act of running away after the court warns them not to. It then lets the status offender be committed to locked facilities. Although it is true that some exception should be investigated for the perpetually unruly child, the Court should not be able to turn a child into a felon by the stroke of a pen, but we see that happening regularly.

Since these inappropriate procedures threaten to further violate the rights of the youth that the Station is commitetd to serving, this problem has heightened our committment to providing legal services to those youth who request it, who are otherwise seeking other services at the Station.

We wanted to bring this concept to the attention of the Committee because we have had great success in maximizing the chances that a given client have his or her best interests pursued if there must be juvenile justice system involvement. We feel that greater funding for direct service through the Runaway and Homless Youth Act would assist each shelter in pursuing quality services in an immediate basis to our client population.

We feel that advocacy services is an aspect of direct services at runaway shelters that deserves financial and other support and it is one way to provide effective help and perhaps the individualized justice for youth at risk which was comtemplated when the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Frevention Act was first enacted.

The Station has assumed the additional responsibility of securing

funds from our local community to support these advocacy efforts based on our experiences which have already demonstrated the critical role this service provides in successful case resolution. I would strongly urge that additonal funds be allocated to enhance the direct services of our existing shelters to provide stronger and more comprehensive services to the youth we are presently serving.

Submitted,

John H. Lawson
Staff Attorney
Safe Space Station
12221 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland OH 44106
216-421-2000

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you.

I will defer to Tom for some questions now.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, at this point, it is almost difficult to know where to start. The quality of the testimony we have heard here this morning is, I think, by anybody's measure, extraordinary, extraordinary in character and its emotion, and its substance, and it is just as compelling as we have heard about the topics that we are dealing with.

Where do I start? Jane Campbell, you have been fighting this fight much as we are fighting on the national level.

Can you describe for us the budget circumstances with regard to this whole arena of endeavor, what you found when you came to the legislature just a few years ago?

Ms. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman and Congressman Sawyer, I will endeavor to do so.

I first was elected to the legislature in 1984 and, so, the first budget that I was involved in was the one that we developed on July 1st, 1985, and I actually know a great deal more about the budget process this session because this session, I have served on the finance and appropriations committee.

And we are in a constant struggle, as I am sure you are well familiar with your service in the legislature, in the legislature in terms of trying to adequately fund education and also provide for the services that are needed in the human services area, and the dichotomy that has established in the legislature is between education and human services, and that is a fundamentally different one than I think that which you have face in Congress when you look at the military versus domestic spending.

And sometimes I wish we had the military so that we could say, now, we can clearly see where the money should come from. In our moves to try to get the money for runaway shelters, the only way that we were able to establish a new money for a project that had previously been funded by the state was by figuring out where there was money in the state budget that was not being used, and as it turned out, there was money in the appropriation that we had made for the Missing Childrens Act that was not really being spent.

And, so, we were able through some wheedling, cajoling and then eventually just winning to decide that that money ought to be spent on our runaway youth, and, so, what we did was really work with the runaway shelters themselves and they were terrific.

I mean, they all were willing to say, OK, we are all going to get just a little piece of money so that everybody can have one, and it was through that kind of a mechanism.

We are, nevertheless, still very much under attack for not being able to provide the funds that are needed for education as well as other human services. Now, personally, I voted differently than some of my colleagues on what we were going to do with the windfall that came from the Federal Tax Reform Act.

Ohio, at that time, we were in the middle of a gubernatorial election. We were all standing for election. People were so anxious to promise that money back that everybody went out and campaigned and promised that money back and right away, we gave the money

back and the vote was—there were only five of us who dissented on that issue.

That has been one of those votes that over time has become a better and better vote, but, nevertheless, we are going to be facing in Ohio looking at the question of whether we are going to be able to do tax increases in order to continue to provide the services that are needed.

Mr. SAWYER. I sympathize with you. Not only the $400 million so-called windfall but the people who bled in order to generate initial levels of state funding back in 1983 in order to support this kind of service, education, a whole range of things that people do. That money came back in substantial quantity as well.

Jane Yackshaw, can you tell us how you have seen the needs of your clients change over time? Can you talk about emerging new kinds of needs that——

Ms. YACKSHAW. Please bear in mind that I have only been running Safe Space Station for 17 months. I would like to defer that question to both John and Rebecca, who have been with Safe Space since it opened 11 years ago.

STATEMENT OF REBECCA DEVENANZIO, DIRECTOR, SAFE SPACE STATION

Ms. DEVENANZIO. Now, we have to carry records with us.

I have been with Safe Space since it started 11 years ago, and I was initially a resident counsellor there and then was the director for four years. I have been gone for two. I am returning and am now back as the director as of this past week.

I think it is in terms of the largest changes that we have seen and the needs of our clients, is in the need for longer term placement resources. Initially, in the runaway shelter business, there was a higher rate of reunification. There were higher rates of families with problems that were reconcilable in the time that we had.

Now, whether the severity of the problems of the kids were not being recognized because we were all very young and the programs themselves were young and somewhat naive, or whether there has really been a much more drastic change in the fiber of the family and society, I do not know.

We are seeing a higher number of kids who are severely abused, physically, sexually, and emotionally. Those kids cannot return home to those circumstances without intense family work.

The family is very dysfunctional. Those kids often then end up in the Department of Human Services custody or the Juvenile Court custody, looking at 2 or 3 or 4 years out of the home. Often in institutions that are not acceptable to the family, so that family work can be done.

That is one area that I have seen a drastic change in. The other is in the lack of resources for teen mothers and their children. As it stands right now, if a teenage mother and her child do not have the family support system around them to help maintain them, then those two people become separated. The infant in one facility, the teen mother in another facility, leading to three or possibly 3, 4, 5 years of separation, at which point the reunification occurs when the kid is old enough to collect public assistance or some-

thing, the mother has no parenting skills, has been separated from her child with no bonding allowed to take place, and often these kids, because of the loss, the emotional loss that they sustained at being separated from their infants, get pregnant again.

So, I think that that is a real serious problem that we are looking at.

The other in Ohio, and I do not know if it is applicable here, but in Ohio, we do not have an emancipation process for our minors, and some of our minors at sixteen are capable of providing somewhat for themselves in terms of how they have a job, they are in some type of training program, and the family system is not appropriate for them. These kids are being forced to remain in the home and it may be a dysfunctional act because the law, the legal structure that we have does not provide a process for them to become emancipated.

That is three I can think of. I think the other thing is just as everyone has said here, you know, we have a service that is phenomenal. If any of you have ever come to a runaway shelter, on the first day that a kid comes there, and look at that kid, just look at them physically, come back 8 or 9 days later, you are looking at a transition that is physically evident. They come in. They are hard. They are cold. They leave there, the spirit has been brought alive again.

You can see it in their faces, you can see it in the way they carry themselves. There is an enormous amount of handling that can happen in a week, a week and a half, that you do not need anything but your eyes to see.

I think the money is a real issue, and I think we have got to start paying these folks that are doing these jobs some decent money and I am real pleased to hear that Safe Landing, you know, has found a way to do that because we sure have not in Cuyahoga County.

Mr. SAWYER. Thanks. Thank you. That is a big help. We think so much in terms of runaway kids as though it is an act of volition. In so many circumstances, when we talk about throwaway kids, when we talk about homeless kids, we are talking about something fundamentally different than the circumstance we faced even at the end of the last decade.

There is one more point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take just a moment to make.

When we think of the kind of runaway shelters and the places where they are put and the places where they are needed most, we tend to think of our more intensely impacted urban settings.

Midge, could you talk about the kind of setting, the kind of community in which you have been working and how that might differ?

Ms. MARANGI. Medina is, oh, an hour or hour and a half from—well, you know, it is funny, because I live in one community and work in another, and one community is an hour, the other is a half-three-quarters of an hour out of the city.

We do even get the city reaching out to our runaway shelter and saying can you provide housing for the Department of Human Services adolescents. We have not taken any out of county adoles-

cents. We have just provided for Medina County and we are seeing a great increase in the numbers we are seeing.

So, our shelter is asked to deal with adolescents up into capacity with the staff. We have a capacity of ten and we have a staff of eight. We have six full-time people and two part-time. And as Sally said before, she said twelve, we have 8, we are asked to house that shelter 24-hours a day.

The kids are not—the problems you see I do not think are a whole lot different. We do see throwaways. We have seen an increase in throwaways. Parents who bring their kids, their adolescents to the shelter and say, now you have them, you keep them. I do not have any answers for those parents at that point. It is their responsibility and they have to deal with their adolescents.

We have drug-related problems. You know, I do not really see a difference in the kind of youth that we serve. In the community I live in, it does not have a runaway shelter, and I have a 17-year-old and a 16-year-old, 14-year-old. I am trying to raise them up before their time, and I hear from my adolescents, Mom, you do work that there, we name, and they will name their friends that have run away, and they run away because of the same crises that Jane talked about or that they talk about in Akron. They run away from situations they feel they have no other choice but to run away and make a statement at that point. I am unhappy with this. So, I am going to remove myself from this situation.

So, I do not see a difference in the population. I see a need no matter what size the community is and where that community fits in our State, in our Nation, for some kind of support system for adolescents and children and families in crisis.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you, Tom.

We have had a lot of hearings in this bill. I have had a lot of hearings in my 23 years either in the State legislature or my 12 years in the Congress.

I think you know yourself, this is an outstanding hearing. This has been just outstanding. Not only in what you have given us intellectually in the area of knowledge, but I think the motivation we need to go back.

We are right now in the midst of a budget process. Fighting the priorities and with the summit agreement reached last year, the terrible fix we are in this year is that there is *x* number of dollars for social and educational programs, so you are going to be finding those of us, the humanitarians down there, fighting among ourselves to a great extent.

For example, the President this year raised total education dollars to $21 billion. I mean, that is a big raise for the President; $21 billion. I love it, being a former teacher, I love it. But I am wondering where he got the $21 billion. Is it from the WIC program, is it from this program here.

So, we are going to find ourselves in a real struggle, but I think what you have given us today is the material we need for intellect, the knowledge, the information, really reinforced some things we knew, gave us some new ideas, new information that is very important as we go back to this struggle to fight for those priorities, but you have also given us the motivation, which is extremely important.

Coming out here, I have always known, Tom knows that, Tom goes home every weekend, I go home to my Flint district every other weekend, but we recognize that all the wisdom does not reside along the Potomac River, the wisdom is really out here in the districts, out here in the country, out here with the people who are really involved in this, and this has come through so clearly today.

My staff and I, agree that this is an outstanding hearing. We are going back reinforced with intellect and reinforced in will to go back and work with this.

So, I just deeply appreciate the two panels and the information and motivation you have given us today, and I would like to keep the record open for, without objection, Tom, for two additional weeks for inclusion of any additional testimony someone might want to include or any additional data that you might have to add to your own testimony.

And with that, unless, Tom, you have a closing statement.

Mr. SAWYER. Not really. Just, Mr. Chairman, and everyone here who has taken the time to be here, thank you. But most of all, thanks to you for making it possible to not only hear this sort of thing, not only to preach to the choir, but to make it possible to get this kind of information on the record.

It is that record that is critical to making it possible for us to have the backing.

Mr. KILDEE. This is part of the record. You know, as part of the record, which, by the way, I taught Latin for the most part, but in history teaching, too, this becomes part of the archives of the United States, and being a historian, I looked to see whether they store the archives down there and, of course, they have various—two places right on Capitol Hill where they are stored forever, in our own building and across the street in the Library of Congress. Then they have another very awesome, as my son would say, awesome place to store these and that is very deep in the granite mountains of Maryland.

They keep copies of the Congressional Record and the hearings just in case we do not have the wisdom to keep the peace. So, hopefully, this record will give us immediate help to get a good bill passed this year and a thousand years from now, some historian will be pouring through those archives, maybe in the mountains of Maryland, finding out what was said here today about our children.

So, thank you very much.

At that, we will stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12 noon, the subcommittee was adjourned.]

[Additional material submitted for the record follows:]

WRITTEN TESTIMONY

REGARDING THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH ACT

SUBMITTED BY: W. Douglas McCoard
Executive Director

DATE : February 29, 1988

Huckleberry House Inc.
1421 Hamlet Street
Columbus, Ohio 43201

==========

RECOMMENDATION:

WE WOULD URGE YOU TO LEGISLATIVELY MANDATE THAT 90% OF THE RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH ACT AUTHORIZATION AND ALLOCATIONS BE USED TO PROVIDE DIRECT SERVICE GRANTS TO ORGANIZATION PROVIDING DIRECT SERICE TO RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH AND THAT THE REMAINING 10% BE ALLOCATED FOR NEW DIRECT SERVICE PROGRAM STARTS, THE NATIONAL SWITCHBOARD, NETWORKING AND TRAINING GRANTS, AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

==========

BACKGROUND:

Huckleberry House is a comprehensive crisis intervention and runaway center that has provided crisis counseling, shelter, and followup for runaway and homeless youth and their families for the past 18 years. It has administered over 8 million dollars. It is funded not only with Federal Runaway and Homeless Youth Act funds but many local resources as well. Local resources include United Way, Mental Health, Franklin County Children Services, The City of Columbus, The Columbus Foundation, The State of Ohio and others. Almost 10,000 hours of volunteer time are contributed annually.

Annual evaluation consistently show young runaways' willingness to use the services of Huckleberry House to resolve their crisis episodes and develop stable living arrangements. The program is family focused with a significant proportion of effort going into followup after crisis services.

Huckleberry House has developed specialities in the areas of adolescent maltreatment and preventing adolescent suicide. These area of expertise were developed initially through discretionary grants supported by the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. One project was a two year cooperative effort with Columbus Children's Hospital ($250,000) and the other was a cooperative effort with North Central Mental Health's Suicide Prevention Service ($50,000).

While these efforts were very worthwhile and provided invaluable information and perspectives, there was not a high committment by the cooperating organizations to continue the efforts once the demonstration period ended. Huckleberry House, however, realizing the level of need and knowledge gained through the demonstration projects continued to provide the services that were provided through the special grants. (At times these expenditures outstripped the resources).

However, without developing other "projects" the Federal Runaway and Homeless Youth Act was limited to the relatively static direct service grants. There were no resources to provide the services that the demonstrations suggested were important. Trying to stabilize funding through continuing to apply for

short-term demonstations does not make good stable policy for runaway centers.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act was originally designed to provide assistance to communities to provide service to runaway youth and their families. The Act has had tremendous success in achieving its goals and objectives! However, significant amounts of money have also supported research and demonstration projects, only some of which have served runaway youth and runaway youth projects. While we recognize the vital importance of research and demonstration, we feel that the intent of the legislation to serve runaway youth is not best support by the level of resources that have been divered away from direct service into discretionary grants.

As a result, we would encourage you to mandate that 90% of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act funds be spent on direct service grants. The balance which is still a very large amount could then be spent on discretionary grants. We would suggest that these include new program starts; research and demonstration; a national hotline; networking and training grants.

As more communities in Ohio have developed services for runaway and homeless youth, the amount for existing centers decreases. This occurs in spite of the fact that the national allocation has increased, because of the total amount going into direct service grants and the state allocation formula. Mandating 90% for direct service would make more money available to Ohio runaway centers. In some cases it could mean more than 20% of the existing grants. This would be very helpful and would go a long way toward maintaining and improving the services we provide.

We would also suggest that new centers be developed out of the discretionary dollars. Often new starts are funded below what is required for start up and they compete with other state centers. The result is not enough resources for either to do a good job. If new starts could come out of discretionary funds initially, then when they were able to demonstrate their effectiveness they could be rolled over to regular grants. This would provide some planning time as well as that stat allocation formulas could be adjusted periodically based on need and service provided.

Huckleberry House has been able to attract consistent local support. In some cases this funding is quite volitile. Other sources have kept pace with inflationary increases and increased need. However, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act resource has not done so. It is in effect a diminishing resource because there has been no increase in the total dollars for direct service grants.

We feel that the recommendation would help restrtix the situation considerable and provide a more stable base from which to provide quality crisis and aftercare service for our runaway and homeless youth.

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE COMMITTEE TO STUDY LAWS
AFFECTING CHILDREN AND YOUTH IN THE STATE OF NEVADA

JUVENILE JUSTICE IN THE '80'S

HISTORY

In the 1960's a major concern was the excessive control of children by parents and institutions of the state that functioned *in loco parentis*. "Freedom for Children" was the battle cry of the 1960's. In fact, this attitude led to the adoption of the Federal Juvenile Justice Act in 1974. Part of the conflict surrounding the Act is the fact that even before this Act was passed the pendulum was swinging. Youth were saying, "we want more of you as parents, you neglect us. We demand that you prepare us for that world out there." Concurrently the American public began to disengage itself from the notion that children who disobeyed the law were misdirected or sick and that left to their own devices they would become responsible, functioning adults; never mind the need for discipline, training, education, protection of the public from juvenile crime, or damage to the institution of the family.

The stated purpose of the Federal Juvenile Justice Act was to "get young people out of adult jails", and an ancillary purpose was to deinstitutionalize the so-called status offender and eliminate juvenile court authority over non-offenders and status offenders. Much to the chagrin of Congress the great bulk of federal money went to the ancillary purposes through the bureaucracy and little if any of the federal largess was spent to "get young people out of adult jails". In fact, the thrust of the federal bureaucracy was to wherever possible deinstitutionalize all juveniles. [1]The State of Massachusetts under Dr. Gerald Miller, Director of their Division of Youth Services, closed down all juvenile institutions overnight in January, 1972. All the youth were placed in private programs in group homes throughout the state. This was hailed as a step forward in the field by radical reformers in other states to urge the closing down of all juvenile correctional institutions. Juvenile judges who cried out in dismay were looked upon as only tring to protect their own future or their own judicial authority. There has been much written concerning the so-called Massachusetts Experiment, but the latest investigative report indicates that it resulted in total chaos: increases in runaway rates and deaths of youths, higher recidivism rates with both girls and boys, and increases in the institution of adult criminal proceedings. A report disseminated in February, 1981 indicated that the State of Massachusetts was rated as having the most punitive penal institutions in the United States. In addition, a report in October, 1986 indicated that the State of Massachusetts had regained the dubious honor of having the highest rate of stolen vehicles in the United States -- an honor they have held for nine of the last ten years. The thrust of the Office of Juvenile Justice created by the Federal Juvenile Justice Act emphasized the duties of parents to provide housing, food, clothing, education, medical and hospital necessities for their children, and further emphasized the rights of the children not to live at home, not to go to school, not to obey their parents. Effectively it emancipated our children at birth.

---

[1]Dennis A. Romig, Justice For Our Children, (Lexington, MA.: D.C. Heath & Co., 1978), pp. 180-182.

The posture of America today is substantially different from that which surrounded the enactment of the Act. People are upset, frightened and angry about juvenile crime, protection of the public, and concern for victims of crime looms large.

Looking ahead, the Juvenile Justice System professionals, the Congress, the Administration, the Office of Juvenile Justice, the legislators of the various states must be made aware of this mood swing and be responsive to it. That Congress is aware is evident from the finding added in the 1980 Reauthorization that the family unit is to be maintained and stregthened and that juvenile judges must have the power to enforce their own orders, i.e., the valid court order amendment. In the 1984 Reauthorization, re-emphasis on the problem of status offenders was placed in the Act and the standards.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT FOR YOUTH INITIATIVE

Following the mandate of the Office of Juvenile Justice, many State Executive Department for Youth determined to get involved in direct community placement programs for youth committed to them by the juvenile judges of their state. These programs were initiated as an experiment and the motivation was to do away with secure facilities and place youth in local communities. The Departments based their whole program on an untested theory that deinstitutionalization not only works better but it costs less. There is increasing evidence that for chronic offenders the opposite of this theory may be true.

The Office of Juvenile Justice commissioned the Social Science Research Institute at the University of Southern California to evaluate the community-based programs funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice. These eight projects were funded at a cost of $13 million dollars for two years to test the theory of deinstitutionalization and diversion. The evaluation grants totaled $3 million dollars. The results are noteworthy. The federal rationale placed considerable faith in a therapeutic model of delinquency prevention and treatment, a model that has lost much of its empirical emphasis in the 1960's and early 1970's. The Act, therefore, became a horse which was possibly losing its mount. [2] The researchers, Charles Murray and Louis A. Cox, Jr., found that the arrest rate for the youths in community-based programs while in residence was 7 times greater than the arrest rate for youths committed to institutions. The study also found that youths released from institutions had significantly fewer arrests subsequent to release than a comparable group of youths released from community-based alternatives. In other words, if upon a permanent commitmennt, the Department wants to place a child dirctly into a group home, do it in the name of humanity -- don't do it because it works -- it doesn't.

[3] Kobrin and Klein in their work entitled "National Evaluation of the Deinstitutienalization of Status Offender Programs" stated "The 1974 Act assumed the existence of a type of youth known as a status offender . . . .

---

[2] Charles A. Murray and Louis A. Cox, Jr., Beyond Probation (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1979).

[3] Solomon Kobrin and Malcolm W. Klein, Co-Principal Investigators, "National Evaluation of the Deinstitutionalization of Status Offender Programs:, Preliminary Executive Summary. (Mimeographed)

the programs assumed the existence of status offenders which are youth separable from and therefore different from delinquent offenders. What would happen if the assumption were incorrect, that today's status offender is tomorrow's delinquent and vice versa? Our own analysis of this suggestion to the contrary that a relatively small proportion of youths cited for a status offense are of a special status offender "type". The catagoric label dichotomy of delinquent and status offender is now specific as a result of the funded research of the federal programs. Findings show that the data along with those from prior studies strongly suggest that the "pure" status offender is a relatively unknown youngster.

The genius of the Juvenile Justice System is the recognition that the juvenile and his or her problems are as important as the offense that brought the individual to the attention of the system. Thus to treat all youths who commit shoplifting the same is to deny the reality that if the child is to be charged or rehabilitated and further delinquency controlled or reduced, a range of options is needed (from doing nothing to providing control). A whole host of local services has developed over the years to asist the juvenile court in diagnosis and treatment. A major goal is to increase not decrease the alternatives available to aid the process.

Disposition in every case that balances the needs of the yoiuth, the family, and the public safety, is described by Judge Lindsay Arthur as "the heartbeat of the juvenile court", and it is here that the law confronts other social media and educational disciplines with the goal of controlling delinquency and protecting society.

Another theory adopted by the Department is "The Juvenile Justice System itself is a secondary cause of delinquency. The further the child penetrates the system, the more delinquent he becomes." Or, "institutionalizxation increases delinquency, deinstitutionalization decreases delinquency". Theory held that community-based voluntary programs would be most successful in reducing delinquency. Nothwithstanding efforts to justify this conclusion at several levels, The Department and the Office of Juvenile Justice has been unable to find research which supports such a conclusion. In fact, with regard to chronic offenders, there is reason to believe that institutional zation may be a significant event that triggers change in offenders so that upon release their re-arrest rate is considerably lower than the re-arrest rate before institutionalization.

A zealous per-ooccupation has forced states and communities to accept and implement untested, unproved and spend-thrift theories and created havoc in the administration of juvenile justice in the 1970's. Recent research findings suggest that havoc was even more disruptive, counter-productive and unnecessary than anticipated.

Fortunately, the State of Ohio never adopted the theories stated above and have, therefore, emerged with less disruptive and counter-productive policies.

THRUST OF THE '80'S

Congress in December, 1980 in its Reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice Act adopted the valid court order amendment, which for all purposes should put to bed the label dichotomy of delinquency and status offenses. Congress recognized that a judge must have the judicial authority to enforce his own valid order. They also recognized in the Congressional Record that the emphasis should be on helping families and children, not contributing to their demise. The Gacy murders in Illinois, the homosexual murders in Texas, the atrocity killings in California .. all involved runaway children. In addition, the Minnesota Strip in New York City where children are forced into pornographic movies and prostitution is a national disgrace. When the State of New York through legislative change practically eliminated the jurisdiction of the juvenile court over status offenders and in particular runaway children, Father Bruce Ritter, Founder of Covenant House on 42nd Street, New York City, was quoted as saying, "it was as if the Mafia had gotten together with the legislators to enact a law that produced the avenue for pornography and child prostitution."

The Commission on Missing Children created by the Attorney General recently filed their report with that office. Among other things, their findings would indicate that the vast majority of missing children are runaways. Although some runaway children are running from neglect or abuse by their parents, there are some who are seeking their freedom and in effect are abandoning their parents. Apparently, this finding is disputed by those who favor total deinstitutionalization and removal of jurisdiction from the juvenile courts. In July, 1985, the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges adopted the report of the Metropolitan Court Judges Committee on Deprived Children. Judge William Gladstone of Miami, Florida was a team leader of that Committee. The judges who made up this Committee had jurisdiction totalling almost 70 million of our population. One of their recommendations was "The courts should have authority to detain, in a secure facility for a limited period, a runaway, truant or incorrigible child whose chronic behavior constitutes a clear and present danger to the child's own physical or emotional well-being, when the court determines there is no viable alternative."

Research would indicate that habilitation and/or rehabilitation of troubled youth occurs with a higher degree of success when said effort can take place in the community in which the youth lives. The reason is obvious. The family of the troubled youth must be involved in the effort. It follows that juvenile judges must have authority over delivery of services to the youth and his or her family. These services must not only be for delinquent and status offenders but also for dependent, neglected and abused youth. The Academy of Contemporary Problems under a grant from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention investigated the issue of the judicial - executive controversary involving services to children in juvenile courts. On Page 106 of that report their research revealed the following:

1) The federal separation of power doctrine does not apply to the states.

2) The entire weight of reported state cases supports the lawful exercise of intake, probation, and detention functions within the judicial branch of government.

3) The argument raised, that the operation of such activities by the judiciary is unconstitutional under separation of powers, is not supported by existing cae law.

In addiiton, the researchers further stated that advocates of executive branch management of delinquency-related services must accept the fact that no legal basis exists for requiring county commissioners to operate those services simply because they are required to fund them.

Since 1982, under the Ohio Plan, juvenille judges have authority over the delivery of services to the troubled youth in their community. Chronic, violent offenders may be committed to the state for long-term treatment processes. Alternative community treatment is made possible through state subsidies based upon population which will be discussed at length by other speakers.

Individual justice for children is the legitimate goal of the Juvenile Justice System. The court must within the bound of State and Constitutional law tailor its response to the peculiar needs of the child and family with goals of (1) habilitating the child; (2) reuniting the family; (3) protecting the public safety. Symplistic solutions and untested theories cannot be tolerated. The most recent research which is certainly available indicates that institutionalization of chronic offenders has the most suppressive effect on future criminal actions and reduces recividism markedly. This is not to say that community placement, group homes, foster homes, et cetera are not needed or desirable, it simply means that they should be used as a secondary placement after institutionalization. Anti-system advocates have had their day .. the voluntary decade of the 1970's. Their theories, dreams, and expectancies have been either (A) unsubstantiated by research, or (B) repudiated by the public. Is it too much to hope they will join forces in the 80's to get on with the business of providing appropriate services that work and are cost effective? Prior to the 1970's many of these same persons who now appear divided and set against each other were common laborers in the vineyard pressing for additional resources for children in trouble.

In conclusion, it is submitted that the goal of the Juvenile Justice System is not the closing of juvenile training schools -- the goal is to close the adult prisons, the adult jails, and the adult probation departments. A state that is building adult prisons and closing juvenile institutions has its priorities reversed.

Respectfully submitted.

WDR:mrg

W. Don Reader, Judge
Family Court Division
Court of Common Pleas
Stark County, Ohio

-5-